



DISTINCTIVE ERRORS OF ROMANISM.

RECEIVED BY THE LIBRARY OF THE

LECTURE-SERMONS

ON THE

DISTINCTIVE ERRORS OF ROMANISM.

Preached in Portman Chapel, St. Marylebone,

LENT 1842.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A.

LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD, AND MINISTER OF
PORTMAN CHAPEL, ST. MARYLEBONE.

"HEREBY WE KNOW THAT WE ARE OF THE TRUTH."

I ST. JOHN III. 19.

Third Edition.

LONDON:

W. J. CLEAVER, BAKER STREET,

PORTMAN SQUARE.

M.DCCC.XLII.

THE HISTORY OF THE

PROGRESS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

FROM THE FIRST TO THE LAST OF THE

REPUBLIC

BY

LONDON:

RICHARDS, 100, ST MARTIN'S LANE.

AND WILLIAM A. REYNOLDS, 10, ST MARTIN'S LANE.

PRINTED BY J. JOHNSON, ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

THE HISTORY OF THE

PROGRESS OF THE

ROMAN EMPIRE

FROM THE FIRST TO THE LAST OF THE

REPUBLIC

BY

P R E F A C E.

THE reason which first pressed upon the writer the very difficult subject handled in the following pages, was, it must be confessed, a personal one. Pursuing, as he imagined, the doctrines of the Church of England in their full integrity, he, in company with many others better than himself, was met with so many remarkable misunderstandings and perversions of the truth, that his mind was unavoidably driven to the question—“*Are the distinctive points which separate Rome from the Church Catholic, sufficiently recognised by our people?*” And this question was immediately followed up by a determination to lay before his congregation some clear and familiar explanation of the real tenets of Romanism; so that the evil of the Church of Rome, and the good of the Church of England, might no longer be looked upon in the confusion which evidently prevailed. This feeling is so fully described in the Introductory Sermon, and also in the General Conclusion, that nothing farther need be said in this place, than to refer the reader thither.

The publication of the Sermons in numbers immediately after their delivery, was adopted with a double object. First, that an opportunity might be given to such persons as might desire it, to obtain information on any one specific subject, without encumbering him with the burden of the whole. And secondly, with the view of destroying *at once*,—*without delay*, those seeds of disaffection which were on all sides displaying themselves against true Catholic principles. There was no time to be lost: many readers would be unwilling to undertake to read a large volume, who might be willing to read a small portion at a time; specially when presented to them on one single subject.

At the same time, however, this plan was not without its disadvantages; for the writer had no opportunity of calmly reviewing and comparing together the whole work when once completed, so as to correct and amend the deficiencies inseparable from the hurry involved in a periodical preparation for the press. Thus, he feels now, upon looking back at what has been done, and when the whole is put together in one view, how very many omissions there are throughout the work, how many things which might have been brought more home in the argument against Rome; and above all, how many things there are which might have been said much better than he has been able to say them. Still however, imperfect as it is, let it go

forth with God's blessing, and *some* good may be achieved, though not so much as might have been under better hands.

There is one great consolation which the writer has received in the progress of this work ; that of finding how universally it has happened, that the adoption of true Catholic principles, has involved the stigma of popery. Our Church seems never to have been entirely free on the one hand from the attack of *Romanist* Dissenters, for abolishing *too many* of the Romish practices and doctrines ; and on the other hand, from the *Puritan* Dissenters, for abolishing *too few*. " It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England," as she says in her preface to the Common Prayer, " to keep the mean between the two extremes ;" but in keeping this mean, so as to avoid the evils of either, she has incurred the enmity of both. What wonder then, if this has been the case with the Church, that it should also be the case with every faithful follower of the Church. Might not the writer claim but in all humility, that this stigma is a proof that with the Church he stands or falls ; that with her, standing in the mean between two extremes, he is as equally distant from the abominations of Rome, as he is from the inconsistencies of Dissent. This is the writer's desire, his hope, his wish, his constant and anxious prayer.

Now behold what great names there are on record testifying to this remarkable truth. Archbishop Potter says :

“I must not forget under this head, that I am again charged not only with favouring Popery, but with being a Papist in disguise, with “acknowledging the Protestant principles for decency’s sake, but stedfastly adhering to the Popish ; and all this it seems for having referred you to the practice and writers of the primitive times, and of the next ages after the apostles. But I am not in the least apprehensive of my being suspected as a favourer of popery by any man *who knows the true meaning of popery*.”*

Nor did even the great Bishop Taylor escape the same mysterious accusation :

“The other thing I am to speak of is, the report you have heard of my inclinations to go over to Rome. Sir, that party which needs such lying stories for the support of their cause, proclaim their cause to be very weak, or themselves to be very evil advocates. Sir, be confident they dare not tempt me to do so ; and it is not the first time they have endeavoured to serve their ends by saying such things of me. But I bless God for it. It is a perfect slander, and it shall, I hope, for ever prove so.”†

Thus it is then : The Church of England, as standing in the mean, and her faithful sons as

* Archbishop Potter. Defence of his Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.

† Three Letters to one tempted to the Romish Church. Letter I ; *Works*, vol. xi. p. 211.

walking in her steps, must ever be content to endure the aspersions of the two extremes which hem her in on either side. All we have to do, is to bear these aspersions with patience, to hold on our course without respect of persons, and to count it as in some sort a sign of truth, that with our blessed Lord, we are called upon to suffer this discipline of the cross.

One thing also, as in controversial reading we must ever bear in mind,—both those who are of Rome, and those who are of England,—that we forsake not charity. When we speak of Romanist errors in strong terms, as we are compelled to do very frequently in the following pages, let it be remembered that we speak not of individuals, but of a system. We can surely separate the one from the other. If any of us have father or mother, sister or brethren, in the communion of Rome, we can still love them as Christians, though we may weep over them for the darkness in which they lie: we may strive by all lawful means to convince them of error, though we may nevertheless still hold them in brotherly love, unbroken. For let the Romanist ever remember, that when we condemn Rome, we condemn ourselves also; when we search out and bring to light her many corruptions and faults, he must bear in mind that we are speaking of ourselves as well as of him; for we also were of Rome three hundred years ago. That we are no longer so, is God's mercy, not our

merit,—His grace, not our work. For *us*, the only point to consider is, our gratitude to God for deliverance from error, in a Church still preserved to us: for him the point to consider is, the sin of his present schism, in remaining as he does in this country, without a Church and without a bishop.

It has been said by some, even some of our own Church, “What advantage is there in thus thrusting upon the public the many unfortunate corruptions of Rome. If you allow the Church of Rome to be a true Church, why revive these points of dispute between us? If unity and peace are things desirable, why add fuel to the fire, and thus rekindle the flames of discord which had well nigh burnt themselves out? To this the answer is plain. It is not *we* who have rekindled these flames, but those who have brought unjust charges against our Church, until they have forced us to show how broad the distinction is between us. One extreme brings against the mean an accusation of belonging to the other extreme. What can we do, but defend ourselves by some clear exposition of what that other extreme really is; and how can this be done save by a faithful exposition of *the whole truth*? One extreme cannot see the peculiarities of the other; there is too great a distance between them. But the mean can see the peculiarities of both: with one hand she can point to catholicity and unity violated, with the other to defilements and superstitions introduced; and while she keeps her

moderate course, she remains as a central point, to which, in the course of God's good providence, all the varieties of dissent in this kingdom may yet once more converge. The answer, then, to any question of the propriety or wisdom of "attacking Romanists," of "abusing popery," or of "stirring up strife," is this: SELF-DEFENCE. Our attack, if it be an attack, is one of necessity, for our own preservation. It is a sally from a beleaguered city hemmed in by an enemy, *on account of the disaffected troops within*; it is a manifestation of strength, sincerity, and truth, rendered imperative by certain circumstances *within the garrison*; rather than any wanton display of enmity or unchristian feeling towards those who are without. If the troops within would remain quiet, and trust their general, there would be no need to resort to this exertion; but confidence must be established, and discipline preserved.

Self-defence, then, is our great reason for any exposition of error, which might to some few minds appear uncharitable. Charity is certainly one great point of Christian duty; but TRUTH is another. And let us remember, that real charity cannot exist at the expense of Truth.

But above all, to a minister of God's holy Word, ordained by solemn imposition of hands, and sent forth with the commission of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Church of England, there is also this great answer;—an answer to which every Pres-

byter of our Church would do well to look in these perilous times,—an answer which the memory of the day of his ordination would quickly furnish him :

THE BISHOP.—“Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word, and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole within your cures, as need shall require and occasion shall be given?”

ANSWER.—“I WILL. THE LORD BEING MY HELPER.”

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

(INTRODUCTORY.)

ON THE PRESENT ALARM IN THE CHURCH.

Acts xix. 32, 33, 34.

| | |
|---|---|
| “Some therefore cried one thing and some another, for the assembly was confused, and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together. And they drew Alexander out of the multitude, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with his hand and would have made his defence unto the people. But when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, ‘great is Diana of the Ephesians.’” | 3 |
|---|---|

SERMON II.

ON THE PRINCIPLE OF ROMISH ERROR.

Deuteronomy iv. 2.

| | |
|--|----|
| “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it.” | 25 |
| Appendix..... | 43 |

SERMON III.

ON TRADITION.—ITS ABUSE.

St. John xx. 30, 31.

| | |
|--|----|
| “And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.” | 47 |
|--|----|

SERMON IV.

ON TRADITION.—ITS USE.

St. John xx. 30, 31.

- “And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.” 73

SERMON V.

ON THE CHURCH.

Colossians i. 18.

- “He is the head of the body—the Church. 97

SERMON VI.

ON THE SACRAMENTS.

Isaiah xxiv. 5.

- “They have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance.” 123

SERMON VII.

ON THE SACRAMENT—SO CALLED—OF PENANCE. PART I.

2 *Corinthians* vii. 10.

- “Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation.” 153
Appendix..... 180

SERMON VIII.

ON THE SACRAMENT—SO CALLED—OF PENANCE. PART II.

St. John xx. 23.

- “Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” 183

SERMON IX.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY.

Revelations xiv. 13.

- “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord ; from henceforth, yea, saith the spirit, for they rest from their labours.” 213

SERMON X.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES.

Psalms xlix. 7.

“None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.” 343

SERMON XI.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

PART I.—SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Hebrews ix. 25, 26.

“Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others ; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” 275

SERMON XII.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

PART II.—TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

St. Matthew xxvi. 26, 27, 28.

“Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take eat, THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for THIS IS MY BLOOD.”. 307

SERMON XIII.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

PART III.—COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

St. Matthew xxvi. 26, 27, 28.

“And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, DRINK YE ALL OF IT, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.” 339

SERMON XIV.

ON DIVINE WORSHIP.

PART I.—RELICS AND IMAGES.

Exodus xx. 4, 5.

- “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them.” 369

SERMON XV.

ON DIVINE WORSHIP.

PART II.—SAINTS AND ANGELS.

Revelations xix. 10.

- “And I fell at his feet to worship him, and he said unto me, See thou do it not ; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus.—Worship God.” 403
Appendix..... 471

SERMON XVI.

ON DIVINE WORSHIP.

PART III.—THE VIRGIN MARY.

St. Luke i. 48.

- “He hath regarded the low estate of his hand-maiden ; for behold from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed.” 435

SERMON XVII.

CONCLUSION.

1 *Peter* iii. 15, 16.

- “Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear, having a good conscience ; that whereas they speak evil of you, as of evil doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.” ... 473
Appendix..... 502

SERMON I.

ACTS XIX. 32, 33, 34.

Some therefore cried one thing, and some another, for the assembly was confused, and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together. And they drew Alexander out of the multitude, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with his hand and would have made his defence unto the people. But when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours, cried out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

THERE have been many times in the history of our Church when the people, awakened as it were from long sleep, have been summoned to put forward a new energy and vigour of spirit in the things of religion. Such a time was that when St. Augustine in the sixth century visited this country as a missionary from Rome. He found Christianity, though long before established in this land, yet well nigh overwhelmed by the inroads of heathenism, and the British Church very nearly confined to a few scanty provinces in the western parts of our island. Such a time was that, when the principles of the Reformation burst forth in

the sixteenth century, and we beheld this great country, for three consecutive reigns, swayed backwards and forwards, as party strength predominated, from the errors of Popery to the truth of her ancient faith, and from her ancient faith back again to the errors of Popery. And such a time is the present, when we all, both clergy and laity, after a century of comparative indifference and deadness, seem to be awakening up into something great and vigorous.

All men seem to say—whether it be for good or evil God knoweth—but all men seem to say that the things of the Church are assuming a character of prominence and importance which is new and unexpected. On the part of the clergy there is altogether a higher and more exalted energy of character, and they are assuming (under God), in a far higher tone than men have been accustomed to behold, the responsible offices and duties of their primitive commission from the Lord Jesus Christ. Much is thought of, spoken of, and done, which a few years back would have been unintelligible. Many practices have been revived among us of ancient discipline; and many doctrines of the Church which slumbered or were held in abeyance have started suddenly to a new life. The apostolical succession of our clergy,—daily prayer in our churches,—weekly communion,—more devotion in our prayers, and less prominence in our sermons,—a higher tone in regard to holy baptism, not only

as an outward rite, but an inward regenerating grace,—a stricter and more continual application to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not only as a spiritual memorial of Christ, but also as a positive channel of God's grace, in the body and blood of our Lord, "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful,"—the catechizing of children in our churches,—the practice of baptizing in the congregation,—and altogether a more minute attendance to all the reverential forms and ceremonies commanded by the Church; in short, the Prayer Book, the Bible, the Canons, Creeds, and Articles of the Church, in every respect more faithfully and literally observed,—these, as you well know, are some of the things of which men speak; they may be considered as a sample of some great movement among us towards a higher appreciation of the blessings and the privileges of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But what is the result? Just precisely as in all other attempts to rouse and awaken the slumbering hearts and habits of men—*much outcry and confusion*. A rejection of all that is said and done by *some* on the pretended score of novelty, a rejection of it on the part of others by an outcry of danger, a fearfulness arising in some by reason of an imperfect development of the principles on which the truths are laid out, and a sophistical junction, on the part of others, of what is confessedly true with certain ERRORS and ABUSES

of the truth, so that the obligations of the things entertained may be avoided.

No otherwise than was exactly the case in that remarkable passage of Scripture which constitutes our text. There you find a people (the Ephesians) dedicated to the most abominable idolatry—particularly notorious for the worship of the goddess Diana. Among this people, the Apostle St. Paul in the course of his apostolical mission arrives. He strives to teach them better things ; he points out the absurdity and the blasphemy of their worship ; he endeavours to purify that which was so foul and abominable among them ; he strives to elevate their minds to something higher and more noble in the worship of God. But what is the result ? A certain impression is evidently made ; for it is said in the 22nd verse, “And at the same time there was no small stir about that way,” and Demetrius calling together the people, addresses them, and says—“ Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which be made with hands ”—but then along with this impression, so created, there arises a very considerable alarm and fearfulness among the people, lest the customs to which they had been from their youth habituated, should be violated—lest in learning those higher truths of religion, which St. Paul brought them, they might lose their cherished habits of worshipping the goddess Diana ; and so great con-

fusion arises among them. Those that are interested in making the silver shrines, misrepresent the matter to the ignorant; the ignorant, hearing of some new thing, flock together to the assembly, to hear what it is about; "some cry out one thing and some another—the more part know not wherefore they are come together." Alexander is put forth, to make a defence to the infuriated people. They will not hear him; the makers of the silver shrines seeing their craft in danger, cry out, "*great is Diana of the Ephesians*"—stop all argument by this cry, and forbid all explanation; and the people following their blind guides, and not in the least aware of what it is that the whole confusion is about,—“When they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice, about the space of two hours cry out, GREAT IS DIANA OF THE EPHESIANS!”

Now it appears that there is something very like this at work among the people of England, at present; I do not of course mean in the same exact sense—but something of this spirit.* It is

* It is very remarkable, that in most of the religious alarms which have visited this country at various periods, their tendency has been in the direction of Rome. Certainly, Rome is to be feared; but so also is *Dissent*. We have witnessed in the last fifty years the rubrics of our Church most shamefully violated in many important points, and our Articles explained away, and our ceremonies forgotten and made dead. Yet because these errors were in tendency towards Dissent or Puritanism, and not towards Rome, they did not create any alarm. For instance, in the service of matrimony, how constant it used to be by some

thus. An improvement and elevation in the religious tone of the people is desired to be taught—a greater hatred of the world—a more entire self-dedication to God—a greater forsaking of the lusts and carnal appetites of man—a more solid foundation for our faith in Christ—a taking up of the cross in greater purity and honesty, through the appointed means of God's grace, the Church, the clergy, and the sacraments. But the people, at least a great portion of them, in strange surmises and misgivings, bewilder one another with an alarming cry, not unlike the Ephesians'—"IT IS POPERY." All that is said in defence or explanation is useless; there is a sort of universal excitement and panic which construes every thing into one language, and turns every thing into one channel of thought; and there sits brooding over men's minds one appalling conviction, which no reasoning can overturn, and no persuasion weaken, "IT IS POPERY." No assurances avail, or explanations by the Bible, or appeals to Church history—there is no confidence in the principles and character of the clergy, no trust in the discipline and authority of our bishops, but all is confusion and alarm—and men dividing the Church into parties, and

to read only a *portion* of that holy service, when the Prayer Book commands it *all* to be read. In baptism also, how frequently was it the custom by some to mutilate and change, or altogether omit, many portions of the service, because the doctrine of regeneration did not suit their views. Yet all this did not create a religious alarm, nor indeed was, or is it noticed or cared for. This, to say the least of it, is singular.

calling those who would, according to the obligations of their office, strive to elevate the tone of religion, by names of *human distinction*, drown all honest discussion (not unlike the case in the text) in one universal outcry of alarm, "*great is Diana of the Ephesians.*"

Thus, my brethren, we perceive a similitude in the EFFECTS of this religious outcry between the *Ephesians* and *ourselves*—but we may also trace it in its CAUSES, and to this let me now beg your attention.

1. You will readily perceive that in the case of the Ephesians one great cause of their outcry was SELF-INTEREST. Demetrius and the men of his craft gained their livelihood by making silver shrines for the goddess Diana; to give up idolatry therefore was against their interest. Their minds came to the consideration of St. Paul's preaching, altogether blinded by the question, of *how much it would cost them to listen to what he said*; and may it not be partially so in our own case? Let us take some of the leading points of observance and doctrine which have caused this outcry, and consider their bearing.

1. First, we might say, the observance of the *Saints' days and festivals of our Church* would be one point, and the observance of daily prayer in churches. What do these observances involve on the part of those who are invited to attend them? a sacrifice of time, a sacrifice of personal convenience, a sacrifice of previous habits. He that has

been accustomed to the usual routine of Church observances, previous, we may say to the last ten years, would have inferred from the silence of the clergy, or at any rate would have inferred from their practice, that the occasional attendance of the members of the Church in the Lord's House, once or twice on Sunday, would be all that God could desire. They were left, therefore, and brought up from boyhood in the habit of thinking that any attendance beyond Sunday in the house of the Lord was not required; that portion of the Prayer Book which is occupied with collects, gospels and epistles, proper lessons, and psalms for peculiar holy days, was passed by altogether, as some old legend not worth attention. It was a *comfortable* doctrine,—suited the luxurious and idle habits of our nature,—fell in readily with our love of ease and of the world, and had therefore many followers. He, therefore, that is all of a sudden asked, and urged to forsake this notion; to consider what our Prayer Book says; to be ready as far as in him lies to add a considerable portion of time (wherever *it is possible*) to the public worship of God; feels it an incumbrance, a demand beyond what is pleasant to comply with; his nature, his worldly habits, his love of ease, rebel, and he too easily falls in with the cry—"THIS IS POPERY; *away with it, I will have nothing to do with such new-fangled notions.*"

2. In a similar way—in the doctrine of weekly, or at any rate very frequent communion.

In order to enjoy this privilege of the Church, sanctifying and blessing our other devotions, it is absolutely necessary that we hold ourselves in, and restrain and check our many evil passions and worldly tendencies. We have had hitherto a notion that an enjoyment of the world in its many frivolous and sometimes sinful pursuits is *not* incompatible with a decent external attendance in the house of God for *pulpit* worship; but we have always had grace enough to think that such things *are* incompatible with *communion* worship. When, therefore, more constant communion is urged upon our congregations, it comes in the way of what we love; not to speak of actual sins,—fornication, fraudulent dealing, malice, revenge, and the like,—but the constant demands of our temporal professions, the accumulation of our riches, the whole heart and soul, every moment of eager time, consumed in the thoughts of the world, politics, and business, leaving no moment for God. It is this we cannot give up, and we do not think ourselves fit, unless we do give them up, for the communion; and so the demand made by the clergy, the preparing of the Lord's table every week, the invitation given so continually is irksome, and conveys a painful memento of what we are, and what we are doing, and where our affections and treasure really lie. And therefore, the cry, "*This is Popery*," comes in very consonantly with our wishes. It is a relief by which our conscience is put to rest. It is a refuge

out of which we can defy the clergy, who make such a demand, and do such things. It is as dust thrown up into the air, under the cloud of which we make our escape, and go on in our worldliness and our sins.

3. In a similar way, again.—The duty of *Fasting*. Such a duty as this—abstinence from food, or at any rate, great curtailment in our way of living at holy seasons and days such as Lent, has been for a considerable time treated with a degree of levity and ridicule, to say the least of it, inconsistent with the Scriptures which speak of it, and our Lord who commands it. But such has been the case. Now it is evident, that to the luxurious habits of the age—among those who place the pleasures of the table among the enjoyments of a civilized man, among those who have been brought up and taught in the lax principles of the past age, enjoying all that has been set before them, without regard to any one but self—it is evident that to such if we were to speak of *fasting* as a Scriptural duty, it would at once be scouted. But how could they escape? Mortification of the flesh, abstinence, self-denial,—nay, absolute fasting to a certain extent and degree—is positively Scriptural, and it is also enforced, and days appointed for it, in our Prayer Book, and its duty enforced by our Homilies. How can they escape? The cry of “*This is Popery*” comes directly to their aid. Because Romanism has fastened upon this duty, as she has

upon so many other duties, an erroneous notion of merit, a penance, therefore the mention of it by the clergy to their congregations is *Popery*. Under this cry, men proceed with their former habits unchanged, and their opinions unshaken. It agrees with their wishes and their interest; and really perhaps without knowing it they join in the senseless cry, and deceive themselves, and are happy.

4. Again, in Church forms and observances: such, my brethren, as have been pointed out to you a very short time ago—to kneel in prayer, to stand at certain doxologies and hymns, as giving praise to God according to the custom of the Church universal, and according to the spiritual meaning of what we are saying and doing towards God. We have been accustomed from our childhood to do otherwise. To stand up at such a portion of the service where we have all along been accustomed to sit, would be an acknowledgment that we have been doing wrong all our lives. To think now that it was right to *sing* at such a portion of the service, when we have been all our lives accustomed not to do so; or where we have all our lives been accustomed to sing, now to refrain from doing so,*

* This refers to the propriety of singing the psalm or anthem after the third collect, and to the *impropriety* of singing at all between the Nicene Creed and the sermon. Now the Rubric is imperative, as directing it to be done after the third collect: "In Quires and Places where they sing, *here* followeth the Anthem." And in regard to the Nicene Creed, there is a direction as to what is to be done *there* in Church service, as follows:

would be an acknowledgment that our previous customs had been deficient. To be rebuked now—some of us men of years, and pluming ourselves upon our superiority of experience and wisdom—to be rebuked *now*, by younger men than ourselves, for doing what all our lives we have thought correct,—all this would evidently be an infringement upon our pride and self-consequence. But still, being taught it by the clergy, what are we to do? Here then comes in, just suitably and aptly, the cry, “THIS IS POPERY.” All these are novelties. They are introductions of a party who desire to bring us back to *Rome*. Away with them! And so men go on in their old habits, perhaps not perceiving all the time that, like Demetrius the silversmith, it is the silver shrines of their idleness, and selfishness, and pride, the silver shrines of an illiberal prejudice, that joins them in the senseless cry of the multitude—“GREAT IS DIANA OF THE EPHESIANS.”

And so I might go on with many other similar points, but these are sufficient to explain my meaning.

“*THEN the Curate shall declare,*” &c.—*i. e.* all Church notices are to be given; and after this it is said, “*THEN shall follow the Sermon.*” There is nothing said of a psalm. The singing of a psalm in that place is, therefore, a violation of the Rubric. In fact, the custom was a mere innovation of the Puritans. Because this custom was put aside, and the old manner of conducting this portion of the service restored—would it be believed!—the humble author of this sermon was assailed by the usual outcry—*Popery!*

It is not meant that what I have said is positively the case with *all*, nor is it meant that all who join in the party-spirit which is set up in opposition of the higher tone of religious feeling which the clergy would desire to inculcate, do so out of a malicious or determined obstinacy to shelter themselves by this cry, in sin or pride;—God forbid. They do it, I may charitably hope, *unwittingly*. They do it without knowing why. I am now only endeavouring to analyze the motives which may possibly, in *some cases*, be the real causes of it, unperceived even by our own hearts: for you know, my brethren, we are never judges in our own case, and we sometimes require the keen sword of the Word of God, to dissect and lay bare before our view the secret workings of our naturally stiff and obstinate hearts; and this is the duty of God's minister, one of his most dangerous (because always liable to give offence), and most difficult duties. May God cause you to understand what is said in the spirit of meekness with which it is uttered, and according to the spirit of the collect, in which we have been this day acknowledging to God, that all our doings, "without CHARITY, are nothing worth."

II. But, let it be granted that all I have been saying is untrue; let it be granted that *self-interest* is *not* the cause of the outcry which we hear; at any rate, that it is not the cause in many. Well then, there is another cause as easily to be traced

in the conduct of the Ephesians—IGNORANCE. In Demetrius himself, it certainly was on the face of it *self-interest*, but in a great majority of the people who followed him in that uproar, it was IGNORANCE, as the text says,—“Some cried one thing, and some another, for the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.”

It is not to be supposed, that in matters of theology, the laity should have acquired that knowledge of the Scriptures, or that keen insight into the history of the Church, which the clergy, by profession, ought of necessity to acquire. Nor is it to be supposed that their minds can be (from being of necessity occupied in the business of their own temporal professions), so spiritually alive to the dangers which surround our common faith, or to the necessity of exertion against the inroads either of malignant enemies, or misconceiving friends, or be so quick and vigilant to see the right moment to put that exertion to account, either in defence or offence, or (to speak generally) have that love and anxiety, and responsibility towards God, which the sacred office of the clergy so awfully and at such great risk demands. Nor can the laity be blamed for this;—surely not. Ignorant they must ever be (more or less), as a body, of the study of divinity. Just as the clergy must be ignorant, more or less, as a body, of the study of medicine; or physicians, more or less, as a body, of the study of the law. There is, and

must be, as every one knows, a keener sensitiveness, a more ready and quick *adaptation* of knowledge, a more certain and definite working of our study in that peculiar branch of learning, to which we are peculiarly dedicated by our calling; and thus no physician is his own lawyer, and no lawyer is his own physician; but we trust to one another (however clever and skilful we may be in the abstract), we trust to one another in that branch of study, science, or profession, which is proper to us. But men in the present day seem to lose sight of this principle in the things of the Church. They submit themselves, *being sick*, to their physician, follow his prescriptions in perfect confidence, and abide by his directions faithfully and submissively. They put their case, being engaged in law, into the hands of their advocate, and follow his counsel at once faithfully and submissively. But when they come to the *Church*, every man seems to have a way of his own, to assume at once that he has a right to heal his own sickness, advocate his own cause, and set up before the world as good a judge of things divine, as the ablest, most faithful, most zealous, most wise of the clergy, who are “set over him in the Lord.” They *do* go through the form of allowing the clergy to ascend a pulpit and preach; they *do* recognise as a form that the ministers of religion have a right to teach; but, then, there seems among us all a tacit reserve, universally kept back within our hearts, of a right to

judge for ourselves whether we will *follow* the teaching or not. Now, is this fair? Is it consistent? Ought not the office of the clergy to obtain at the hands of the laity (to take the lowest ground) the same proportionate confidence and trust that the office of any other profession, as a profession, obtains from others out of that profession. That is the lowest ground; but if we consider farther the *sacredness* of the profession of the clergy; that every one who comes before men in this character, comes under the holiness of hands laid upon him, and under a most solemn ordination vow, a setting apart under the most fearful responsibility, and “*woe if he preach not the Gospel* ;”—if we consider farther, that, in every other profession, a man is trusted solely according to his own individual cleverness or reputation, but the clergy never claim any confidence from their own individual cleverness or reputation, but solely from the teaching of the Church and of the Bible, to which they ever appeal, and whose representatives under God they are ;—if we consider all this, is it not, I would confidently ask, a strange anomaly, to find so many shutting their ears, and closing their eyes, and crying out, they know not what, without any fair and temperate consideration of the questions laid before them?

Now those that make the outcry (“the more part knowing not wherefore they are come together”) are in a dilemma. Either their whole

lives, and minds, and spirits, have been dedicated to the same studies and researches as the clergy—and on that ground they are right in making the outcry (but this they cannot say); or they are making the outcry in ignorance, and refusal to trust or place any confidence in their clergy, which I have just now shown to be *unfair*. Either then they ought immediately to go and study for themselves, and make their reading as great, and their learning as deep, and their calling as sacred, as that of the clergy; or they ought in common fairness to cease the outcry, and place a little more confidence in the office of the ministry. There is a Bible, there is a Prayer Book, there are Articles, there are Creeds, there are Canons, there is a Church. My brethren, we dare not, if we could, teach you any thing contrary to those rules and guides of our Faith. If the clergy differ among themselves, as unhappily they do in many *details*, yet, remember, they cannot differ on many *ESSENTIALS*, and remain in the Church.* We have bishops, who will not suffer

* An instance of this will be fresh in every one's mind—the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp. Professing opinions at variance with the Church, he seceded from her, and became a Dissenter—*i. e.* a Romanist, for a Romanist is a Dissenter in this country. But let the reader carefully observe in this case, that Mr. Sibthorp, in going over to the Church of Rome, only returned to the impressions of his early youth; for it is stated by himself, that “in *early life he sought admission into that Church [Rome], and but for the interference of the law, being under age, he would have joined her*” then. So that in this unhappy case we must

it (and in this we may thank God for our episcopal jurisdiction), but differ as they may in *details*, they cannot differ in *ESSENTIALS*. As long as there are, as I just enumerated, a Bible, a Creed, a Prayer Book, Articles, and Canons, they must obey and follow them ; and if in their teaching they do obey and follow them, then the outcry of "Popery" must be either a malicious and self-interested cry, or a mistaken and an ignorant cry ; in either case, an unreasonable cry.

And now, my brethren, I must just shortly state to you the *reasons* of these observations. It is the duty of the clergy to have compassion and tenderness towards those who are alarmed, from *whatever source* that alarm may arise. It is the duty of the clergy not to rule it over God's heritage, with a high hand, as though they had no share in the infirmities of the weak, but to remember that there may be many causes at work, either from the malice of the devil or man, by which the unstable are wrested from their good intentions, and that the ignorant require instruction, the weak strength, the distressed consolation, and the timid courage, to be imparted to them through their ministrations. It will not do to declaim ; we must teach. To answer this outcry about

wonder at the infatuation, if not the dishonesty of mind, which caused him to seek for holy orders in the Church of England at all, rather than have any surprise that he should now have seceded *back to Rome*.

“POPERY,” we must buckle on our armour, and be ready to fight the good fight of faith ; we must see what Popery really is : it will not do to pass by this uproar as though it were a thing of no moment ; it *is* of great moment, and we must appease it. People in general do not know what Popery is. People in general do not know what our holy and beloved Church in England is. There is a confusion among us as to what is Romanism, and what is the Church of England. This is evident from the alarm which is now sounding in our ears at every turning of the street. I have endeavoured in this discourse, by way of a preface or introduction, to analyse that alarm, to ascertain what its causes are ; but I must not stop there : it behoves me to allay it ; it behoves me to take good care lest the cords of affection and love, which (perhaps I may not be presumptuous in saying, under God’s grace) have hitherto joined us together, as a pastor and his flock, be not dissevered ; it behoves me to take care lest the confidence and trust which (I hope I am not presumptuous in saying, under God’s grace) have hitherto existed between you and me, be shaken by an outcry raised from without, which has no meaning :—I say from *without*, for I verily believe it has not originated among ourselves. But still, again, it is of no use to *assert* that it has no meaning. I must prove it. I must endeavour, however difficult and laborious it may be,—to de-

precate the misunderstanding which may exist in some, and to instruct the ignorance which may exist in others. Unless the confidence and love which ought to join together the pastor and his flock be strictly maintained, his preaching might as well be to the winds. Perhaps I have presumed too much on the confidence which I *thought* I possessed. Perhaps I have exhorted you to points of duty in your devotional exercises, and in your hearts and lives, as Christians, presuming too much on your trust in me; and that, according to the power of the Gospel, your faith would rise to the desired point by the effectual working of the Holy Ghost; and that as I had full confidence in you, that you would understand me, so you would have full confidence in me, that I should not mislead you. But God, no doubt, has humbled both you and me, and made our glorying void, for some good purpose.

I intend, as I just said, to the utmost of my humble ability, to set to work with a cheerful spirit, in order to lay before you the real grounds of difference between the two churches of Rome and England. This will occupy a considerable space of time. The season of Lent seems suitable for this purpose. I propose to carry on a series of lectures on the principal points of the DISTINCTIVE ERRORS OF ROMANISM, as far as it can be done with charity, and as far as it can be done in a manner suitable to general capacities. May

God, of his infinite grace, bless this endeavour, and prosper it to his glory. May God, of his all-wise mercy, “stablish, strengthen, settle us,” and “keep us stedfast in the faith;” so that we may all have more solid grounds and reasons for the hope that is in us, than many of us now seem to have; so that we may keep ourselves distinct and clear as members of the Catholic Church of Christ, without being considered members of the ROMAN Catholic Church; so that we may have comfort and assurance that all we have done or said, is so done and said as members of a far purer faith than *Romanism*, even the faith that is “built upon the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the head corner-stone;” so that we may worship God with all devotion and warmth of feeling, and due attention to the reverential forms which our Church has commanded, in prayers and sacraments, and other holy ordinances, without being called, or even liable to be called *Papists*, OR ANY OTHER NAME DERIVED FROM MAN; so that we may go on our way, no longer galled, fretted, and wearied, by the many insinuations of gainsayers, but *rejoicing, feeling confidence*, turning not aside to the outcries, either of mistaken friends, or wilful enemies, but keeping our placid course, right on our way towards heaven, in the patient assurance of a conscience “void of offence towards man, and towards God.”

"I AM NOT THE LEAST APPREHENSIVE OF MY BEING
SUSPECTED AS A FAVOURER OF POPERY, BY ANY MAN WHO
KNOWS THE TRUE MEANING OF POPERY."

ARCHBISHOP POTTER, *Defence of his Charge to the Clergy
of the Diocese of Oxford.*

SERMON II.

DEUT. IV. 2.

*“Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you ;
neither shall ye diminish ought from it.”*

BEFORE we proceed to the several points of difference between the two Churches of England and Rome, it will be useful if we make a few observations on the *principle* of that difference ;—because if we can find any one leading general principle, it will serve as a guide by which we shall more readily understand the various details which may afterwards be put before us.

The leading principle of the difference between the two Churches is *addition*—addition on the part of Rome. We do not find that the Church of Rome falls short in any doctrine, creed, or practice, of that which the Church of England holds ; but we always find that, when there is a difference, it is by reason of the Church of Rome *adding* something of her own to that which we possess in common. Up to a certain point in the road we go together. Then we separate ; but

we never separate in consequence of our going farther than they, but always in consequence of their going farther than we. The *foundation* of the building of the Church of Christ is in both alike ;—it is only in the *superstructure* that the discrepancy begins to be seen.

Now this principle it is very important to observe, for it is a principle modelling and directing all controversies of faith ;—not only controversies in regard to Rome, but *all* controversies. And if we consider a little, we shall find that, from the nature of things, it *must* be so. Two men, generally speaking, do not take two diametrically opposite opinions on a matter of belief,—one positive, and the other negative ; but one believes a certain portion, another believes more. You do not find two men, one asserting that there was no such person as Christ, denying altogether his historical existence,—and the other as positively asserting that there was such a person. On the contrary, you find both agreeing together as to the fact, but the one believing it only to a certain extent,—as that he was a real man ; the other agreeing thereto, but going farther, and believing that he was also God. Let us take it in most of the great differences of religion. Let us take the great foundation of all religion—the existence of a Deity. In this we find Jews, Turks, Unitarians, and even the uncivilized tribes of every nation under heaven, all agreeing together. There is

one general basis of their belief. But then Christians advance upon this belief,—believe more ; and not only believe in the Unity, but also in the Trinity of the Godhead ; and in this we immediately part company with those Jews, Turks, Unitarians, and the like.

Take again a farther step—*Church Government*. That there should be some ministers of religion, all Christians agree ; and so we find Methodists, Anabaptists, Independents, and, in short, all the sects, agreeing with ourselves. But then we go on,—add to this joint faith,—and say that not only must there be ministers of religion, but they must be appointed of God, by laying on of hands of bishops,—and, by this addition, immediately part company, and leave behind all those sects, together with Presbyterians and many others.

Now, it is the very same principle which causes Rome to be disunited from ourselves. They go beyond us ; and in like manner as we ourselves are at variance with the sects just mentioned, by reason of our going farther than they, so we are at variance with Rome, because Rome goes farther than we.

I must endeavour to illustrate this truth by reference to some of the more prominent points in question between us.*

* The points of doctrine which follow are only stated here in general terms, as facts. Their proof in detail will follow, when we come to consider the questions seriatim.

1. We both agree in saying that God, our Almighty Heavenly FATHER, and God the everlasting and only-begotten SON, and God the everlasting and ever-sanctifying HOLY GHOST, is a Being to whom our prayers and worship should be addressed. But then Romanists go farther, add to this, and say that the Virgin Mary, as the Mother of God, is a being to whom prayers and worship should be addressed. This we do not believe, because it is an addition ; and so we are at variance.

2. We both agree together in saying that our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is a mediator by whom our prayers may go up before the throne of God, and find acceptance : but then they go on, and add to this joint faith, by saying that the saints are also mediators, and through them, as well as through Christ, they may make their prayers to God, and find acceptance. This we do not believe, because it is an addition ; and so are at variance.

3. We both agree together in saying that after this life, while the body remains in a state of corruption, the soul exists in an intermediate state : but then they go on, and add to this joint faith, by saying that it is a state of purgatory, and that the soul suffers a certain degree of punishment, in some cleansing and purifying process, enduring the wrath of God for sin. But this addition we do not believe ; and so are at variance.

4. In a similar way, we both agree together that in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is a real presence of Christ, and that in the bread and wine, when consecrated, there is the body and blood of our blessed Redeemer, "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful" (these are the words of our Catechism): but then they go on, and add to this joint doctrine of a real presence, and define that which we do not define, and say that there is a *transubstantiation* of the bread and wine, and that, after consecration, the substance of the bread and wine no longer remains. This we do not believe, because it is an addition to the faith; and so are at variance.

5. In regard to *Confession*. Confession of sins, not only to God, but to one another, we both hold to be right, and invite it as a Christian duty. But Rome goes on; and while we merely invite or recommend it in certain cases, Rome compels it, and makes auricular confession vital to salvation.

6. In regard to *Absolution*. We both hold the "power of the keys"—that is, the power of binding and loosing, according to the apostolic commission given to the Church. We both agree in holding it as declaring God's message, and the "ministry of reconciliation." But then Rome immediately advances; and while we do little more than consider it as a declaratory or ministerial act—or at furthest do no more than consider the Church

as the channel or instrument of conveying the desired remission—Rome positively declares it a *judicial* act,—takes, as it were, the power out of God's own hands, and makes every priest the *judge* as well as the conveyer of the absolution promised.

7. In regard to *Church Government*. That the Church shall be governed by bishops, and that every bishop should have his diocese, wherein to take the oversight of the flock of Christ, we both agree; and moreover that even bishops themselves should be subject to the jurisdiction and authority of their metropolitan or patriarch, we both agree; but then immediately Rome advances, and will not suffer every nation to have its Church, and its metropolitans, and its bishops,—but carries it on to one universal bishopric, making the Pope of Rome the head, not only of the Roman Church, but of *all* Churches.

8. In regard to the power vested in the Church for ordering its affairs, and pronouncing on its doctrines, we both agree together that there is this power vested, and that to general councils and synods this power may be committed;—but then Rome immediately advances, and says, this power is *infallible*; and, while we say every Church may err, she says that, in herself, there lies an infallibility of judgment, committed to her by God, and that all and everything pronounced by her decisions, bears *ipso facto* the seal of truth, which cannot err.

9. In regard to the necessity of an apostolically ordained clergy to give efficacy to the virtues of the sacraments, we both agree,—and would say jointly, that no man, for instance, could presume to consecrate the Holy Eucharist unless he had a commission transmitted to him from Christ as a priest so to do : but then Rome goes on (and one of the most fatal of her additions this is)—Rome goes on, and says—that not only must there be a priest, but the priest must have *a right intention* ; that, not only is there no sacramental grace imparted without an appointed officer, but unless that officer possess within him at the moment an intention of imparting the grace, the grace is not imparted.

10. In regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Holy Eucharist. That there *is* a sacrifice we both agree : a sacrifice, both in the things offered to God, and in ourselves, our souls and bodies, and in our praise and thanksgiving. But, then, Rome goes on—and to this joint sense of a sacrifice therein maintained, she adds, that there is a real sacrifice of the actual body and blood of our holy Redeemer ; and, that as often as the Mass is said, our Lord's sacrifice is repeated, — and his very body, and his very blood, broken and shed continually by the words of man.*

* There is one point of practice wherein this principle of *addition* does not appear to hold good—that of the denial of the cup to the laity. It would appear that in this we have advanced

So we might go on, but these instances will suffice to show what is meant when it is said that the principle of the discrepancies between ourselves and Rome, is that of *addition* on the part of Rome.

But, now it will be said, How does it come to pass, that when we, as the Church Catholic of England, admit that we differ from Dissenters by *addition*, we are right in our additions; when, at the very same moment, we see the Church of Rome differing from us by addition—and yet they are *wrong* in their additions? Is not the same principle at work? What right have we to add, and be right—and yet not allow to them the same privilege?

Why, it is evident that there must be some GROUND—some *authority*—some *reason*—for one man believing more in his religion than another. No man has a right, by the mere pleasure of his own will, to invent an addition to the faith of other Christians, and then say he is better than they, because he believes more. It is not the mere fact

upon Rome, and do more than she does; or rather that she has *subtracted* from the faith in this instance, and not added. But her doctrine is, that the blood of Christ as well as the body is conveyed in the bread,—that one element is sufficient to impart the graces of both. So that in fact even here she has *added*, for she has invested the one element in the Holy Supper with the virtues of two; and though our Lord appointed two, as conveying the pledges and channels of his love, she has raised *one*, as far as the laity is concerned, to the power of those two.

of believing more, but the GROUND OR AUTHORITY of his believing more. And, when we come to examine this ground, or authority, between our Church and Dissenters, though we find that we do believe more, yet, for all that is so believed, we have a very solid warranty and reason; in fact, we find that we have only believed what all Christians, up to a certain period of history, ever did believe,—and that though we have allowed, just for the moment, the use of the word ADDITION—it is not a right word as applied to *us*. It is they who have *subtracted* from the Universal Faith, not we who have *added*. It is they who have fallen short—not we who have gone beyond. Whereas, in examining the additions of Romanism by the same ground or warranty, we find that they are, in reality, positive additions—that they believe, and say, and do things, which do not rest on any safe warranty at all; that we can lay our finger on such and such a period of time, when the doctrines they hold did not exist in Christianity; that, therefore, while our overplus in faith beyond that of Dissenters arises from their deficiency—the Romanists' overplus of faith beyond ours arises from their own inventions. We, therefore, are right, in believing more than the Dissenter—and the Romanist wrong, in believing more than we.

But it is obvious that the truth of this assertion must be tested by the *ground* just spoken of. What is this *ground*—*warranty, authority, or*

reason—by which we can tell who is right and who is wrong? How are we to find out and prove that, for instance, our insisting upon the ordination of ministers of religion, by laying on of hands by bishops, is a right doctrine,—and that the Dissenters, in denying this doctrine, have deviated from the practice of all Christians, and, therefore, are wrong, by reason of *subtraction* from the faith; and yet, on the other hand, that the Romanist, in teaching the people to offer up their prayers to the Virgin Mary, has deviated from the practice of all Christians, in interpolating something which was not there before, and therefore is wrong by reason of *addition* to the faith? How can we convince ourselves of this? By what *rule* shall we consider it? On what *ground* shall we take our footing so as to ascertain the truth of what we say? By what *warranty* do we assert ourselves to be the only right party in the question—keeping the middle way of truth, neither diminishing with one, nor adding with the other. This, indeed, is the turning point of the whole difficulty, the hinge on which all else revolves.

Now, let us consider carefully that religion differs from all other subjects of disquisition among men, inasmuch as it is a matter of *Faith* rather than a matter of fact, or reason, or taste.

Moral Philosophy is a matter of reason—a disquisition by argument—whether this or that way of action is the better. Natural Philosophy is a

matter of fact—a disquisition by arrangement of certain data, or an induction from certain principles bringing out results. Politics are a matter of reason—and men argue thereupon on different sides, from a certain impulse, or bias of mind, one way or other. Mathematics are a matter of fact, which men handle, and shape, and turn to different ends, as suits their object at the time; but all are within the compass of their mental powers, all depend upon certain visible and tangible materials which are either before them or within them. Again, on the other hand, there are things upon which men deliberate, which are subjects of taste;—all the Fine Arts,—Poetry, Painting, Sculpture, and the like. These do not either depend on the reasoning powers of man or on facts (at least, it is not their *essence*). They depend on the *imagination*. They are not tied down by any definite bindings or laws, but are entirely arbitrary, are left open, and suggest points of admiration rather than lay down subjects of knowledge. Nevertheless they are within the compass and ken of man's intellectual and mental capacity.

But, from all this, RELIGION holds a wide and totally distinct path. She depends neither on the reasoning power of man, nor on facts, nor on taste (she does depend upon facts, in one sense, but then the facts are not matters of *knowledge*, but matters of FAITH); so, that virtually, she does not depend upon facts. She de-

pend on a process of the mind, totally distinct and apart from all others. She does not argue like the politician, but she believes. She does not take data and make inductions, like the mathematician, but she hears something asserted, and assents. She does not revel in the dreams of the poet, or the genius of the painter, or take up some point which admits of dispute, pleasing to the fancy of one, or displeasing to the fancy of another, and, in neither case, wrong,—but she hears something commanded as a duty and obeys. Unlike every other, either passion or action of the mind, she does not seek for knowledge first and then pronounce an opinion, but FAITH first, and knowledge afterwards. And this faith does not rest upon man, but upon *God*. This faith, as long as it is not *contradictory* to reason, does not heed how far it may be *beyond* reason. This faith being occupied on subject-matter, not visible or tangible, or in any way material, has a feeling and acknowledgment, that men cannot direct it, or shape it, or control it,—while, at the same time, depending upon Almighty God, and the definite authority of His direction, it cannot wander into any of the extravagances of the unlimited regions of taste or imagination.

Thus we see what a peculiar and insulated place religion takes as a subject of man's disquisition—it rests entirely upon God. Had not God revealed himself to man, we may safely say

there would have been no religion. Not even the Jewish religion could have existed, had not God revealed himself to Abraham ; not even the knowledge of one true God would have been retained among men, had not God revealed himself to Noah ; and though certainly by the preservation of Judaism, and from our own reasoning powers, enlightened by the revelation which God distributed through all nations of the world from Noah, there did exist a certain knowledge of God, yet we know how corrupt that knowledge became,—and, therefore, may safely say, that without this additional light imparted, we should eventually have lost it altogether. But, however this may be, whether this be true or not, in regard to Christianity, we are quite sure that we should have known nothing whatever of *that* unless it had been revealed from Heaven. The doctrines of Christianity are so extraordinary, so repugnant to our nature, so subversive of all our propensities and ways of thinking, that we must all allow, that no earthly being whatsoever could have invented such a thing ; it is altogether so vast, so tremendous in its announcements, so fearful in its punishments, so glorious in its rewards, so magnificent in its working out the processes of God's ways, that it is quite impossible that it should be here among us, unless it came from God. No, upon this all men agree.

But, if all men agree, let us see what immediately follows :—

It comes from God—it is God's revelation of his will ; therefore, whatever is to be believed or done, whatever is to be laid down as a matter of doctrine or duty, must have its ground or warranty as coming from God. THE REVELATION OF ALMIGHTY GOD is, then, the ground for which we were in search. Neither men's arguments, nor men's tastes, nor men's reasoning processes, nor men's habits and customs, nor men's authority or dicta—but solely the REVELATION OF GOD. Here is the rule which we sought—the *authority* by which we are to be guided—the *ground* on which we are to stand, while pronouncing on the important points of our difference from Dissenters on the one hand and Romanism on the other. Let the Dissenter show to us that we are either doing or believing anything contrary to God's revealed will, and then we will confess that we have been adding to the Faith, and, therefore, are wrong ; or if *we* can show to the Romanist, from God's revealed will, that *he* has been adding to the faith, then he must acknowledge that he is wrong. The Rule of Faith is clear (and I believe), however we differ afterwards in its interpretation, that it is universally agreed to be, as I just said, "THE REVELATION OF ALMIGHTY GOD."

And, my brethren, could we rest here,—had we no need to go farther into the subject, so as to see *what* this revelation of Almighty God is,—happy

would it be for us ; for here is the precise point—even on this very outset of our discussion—here, on this very point it is, that Rome begins to ADD. Let us agree—and *we are agreed*—that the revelation of Almighty God is our rule of faith but then we are not agreed as to *what* is this revelation of God ; for while we are careful and precise in our assertion that, in the proof of all matters essential to salvation, the Holy Scriptures, and they alone, are the revealed word of God,—Rome asserts, in *addition*, that it is to be found equally well in certain oral communications which God vouchsafed to the Apostles and first Christians. These oral communications she calls *Tradition*. Our doctrine is, “*Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation ;*” and by Holy Scripture we mean the *Canonical Books*. *Their* doctrine is, that there is in the Church certain *unwritten* communications from God, of equal authority with that which is *written*. She proves many of her main doctrines from these unwritten communications, together with the Apocrypha ; and hence immediately all our complicated differences arise. Rome thus *commences* the variance, by the principle of addition in the very rule of faith ; and she then carries it on to an almost unlimited extent, in the details of the doctrines which her Church maintains.

This principle then it will be our next business

to consider. Upon the point whether Rome is right or wrong in the addition which she makes to that which *we* consider our sole authority for the articles of faith necessary for salvation, we must be satisfied before we go farther; and therefore this will necessarily form the subject of our next lecture, because the principle being clearly defined in our minds, which I have now endeavoured to explain, the understanding of the details which will follow will be the readier.

Let me repeat it again;—let me be clearly understood. It is not that we are two adversaries directly oppugnant to one another,—such as the Socinian is to us, who denies the divinity of Christ, or the Atheist, who denies the existence of a God: it is not that we come from two hostile quarters, like enemies, having neither country, nor language, nor origin in common;—but that, like friends and brothers *once*, they have parted from us, and left us behind by reason of unauthorized assumptions, and wild demands upon our faith, to which we could see no just reasons to give heed. For a time journeying on the same road, with one common starting place, and one common object, we made our way together;—but clouds and thick darkness came over us both, and we lost our way. Strange additions, and the over-loadings of the simplicity of our faith, encumbered us both. The inventions of men, by the malice

of the devil, choked all the good and pure intentions of us both. *Together* we lost our way—*together* we stumbled on the dark mountains—*together* the light that was within us grew less and less, and became nearly extinguished, by reason of the self-assumed and unnecessary burdens which surrounded it ;—when lo, of a sudden, it pleased God to deliver *us*, and not to deliver them. It pleased God to cast away from *us* all the unnecessary and unjustifiable appendages, additions, and burdensome superstitions, with which we both had been for so many years encumbered, while it pleased the same God to leave *them* still where they had been. *We* are restored,—*they* are left ; the light to *us* shines freely,—to *them*, their own additions to the light, which had made it darkness before, still remain.

Thus, as it must naturally be, you will see a brotherly likeness still between us both, as children sprung from one common mother ; but that likeness very difficult in many places to distinguish, by reason of the human dress with which one of the brothers still remains encumbered. In all you will trace (both doctrines and practices) one common source, one common foundation ; but as the building rises, you will find one party of a sudden diverging into every sort of extravagant fancy and unauthorized dogma ;—the other, restoring his structure even as the wise Master-

Builder ordered it, to its original shape, neither going beyond, nor falling short, of the precepts by which He willed it to be raised. May God of His infinite mercy maintain and strengthen the one,—and whensoever it shall so please Him, reform and purify the other!

APPENDIX.

LET us observe, by way of corroboration of these remarks, that all through the Reformation of our Church, the principle of defence against the opposing parties of Romanism and Dissent, has invariably been to show, on the one side, addition to the faith, and, on the other, subtraction. Our articles are drawn up with this view:—they are not so much expositions of the Faith of the Church, but rather protests against error, proving against the sects, that they are wrong in holding less, and, against Romanism, that she is wrong in holding more, than ourselves. The principle of our argument in the articles against Romanism is this:—“For all the articles which you assert as necessary to salvation, you cannot show any authority previous to the fourth, fifth, or sixth centuries; we, on the contrary, can lay our fingers on certain points of history, and say, “Here were they *added*,—therefore, they are not true.”

And thus all our great divines of the Reformation conduct their arguments. The following are some quotations illustrating this principle:—

Bishop Jewell, in his sermon at Paul’s Cross, speaks thus:—“If any learned men of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private Mass in the whole world for the space of six hundred years after Christ, or

that there was any communion administered unto the people in one kind, or that the people had their common prayers in a strange tongue that they did not understand, or that the Bishop of Rome was then called a Universal Bishop, or that the people were then taught that Christ's body was substantially, corporeally, carnally or naturally, in the Sacrament. If any man alive were able to prove any one of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church, I promise that I will give over and subscribe to them."

The point he takes up is this:—All these articles of Roman faith are not to be believed, because they are additions, not being heard of for the first six hundred years of Christianity.

Precisely in a similar strain, Dr. Jackson says: "The fallacy by which the Romanists deceive poor simple people is, in making them believe that our religion and their religion, our faith and their faith, are *duo prima diversa*, or so totally distinct, that part of the one could not be included in the other. But first, nothing is held as a point of faith in our Church, but the present Romish Church doth hold the same; so that for the form of faith established in our Church, we have the consent of the primitive Church, of the four first general Councils, and of all succeeding ages unto this present day; the consent likewise of the present Roman Church, and of ourselves. Now our consent and their consent, our confession and their confession, is more universal than their consent without ours. But if their consent unto the points of faith believed by us prove our faith to be universal, and our Church by consequence to be Catholic,—why should not our consent unto the points of faith believed by them prove *their* faith to be

universal, and *their* Church to be Catholic? Because it is not enough to hold all points of Catholic faith, unless the same points be kept holy and undefiled. The Romish Church, we grant, doth hold all points of Catholic faith; and so far as she holds these points, we dissent not from her; yet dissent from her we do, in that she hath defiled and polluted the Catholic faith with new and poisonous doctrines, for which she neither hath the consent of antiquity nor of the Reformed Churches. And so she stands convicted of schism and heresy, by the rule of Vincentius;—a proficiency or growth in faith he allows and grants, so it be in the same kind, or proceed from the same root; but for *additions* and *new inventions*, he takes them for the marks of schism and heresy.”

In the same manner Bishop Taylor, in his “Dissuasive from Popery:”—“Now, then, suppose any article; I demand, did Christ and his apostles declare it to the Church? if not, how does the Pope know it, who pretends to no new revelations? If the apostles did not declare it, how were they faithful in the house of God? And how did St. Paul say truly, ‘I have not failed or ceased to declare to you all the whole counsel of God.’* But if they did say true, and were faithful, and did declare it all, then was it an article of faith before the Pope’s declaration; and then it was a sin of ignorance not to believe it,—and of malice, or pusillanimity, not to confess it,—and a worse sin to have contradicted it. And who can suppose that the apostolical churches and their descendants should be ignorant in anything that was then a matter of faith? If it was not *then*, it cannot *now* be declared that it was so then. Christ’s preaching, and the apostles’ imposing it, made it an article of faith in itself; and to us other declarations excepting

* Acts, xx. 27.

only teaching, preaching, expounding, and exhorting, we know none, and we need none; for they (Christ and his apostles) only *could* do it, and it is certain they *did it fully*."

And, lastly, one more author, *Bishop Bilson*. He does not deal in generals, but he enumerates the specific articles in which he says that Rome had added to the faith: "Your having and adoring of images in the Church; your public service in a tongue not understood of the people; your gazing on the priest while he alone eateth and drinketh at the Lord's table; your barring the people from the Lord's cup; your sacrificing the Son of God to his Father for the sins of the world; your adoring the elements of bread and wine with divine honour, instead of Christ; your seven sacraments; your shrift; your releasing souls out of Purgatory, by prayer and pardons; your compelling priests to live single; your meritorious vowing, and performing pilgrimages; your invocation of saints departed; your rules of perfection for monks and friars; your relying on the Pope, as head of the Church and Vicar-general under Christ; these, with infinite other superstitions in action, and errors in doctrine, we deny to have any foundation in Scripture, or confirmation in the general consent or use of the Catholic Church."

SERMON III.

JOHN xx. 31.

“And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.”

THE Churches of Rome and England, and indeed all Christians, agree together in maintaining that the *Revelation of Almighty God* is to be their sole warrant and authority in matters of faith and duty. This agreement is but consistent with common sense, and is founded on that principle which I endeavoured to explain in the last lecture—that religion must, from its nature, and the Christian religion especially, derive its right to impose any obligation on man from God, and from God alone. The question which next occurs, and which was reserved for this day, now comes before us: What *is* the revelation of Almighty God? Herein too we agree to a certain point; for both agree that we possess a *volume*,—a holy, mysterious, sacred volume,—which contains in its written pages the will of

God. By this we both agree in the main articles of our faith ;—by this we both believe that God hath spoken to man, both in the Old Testament and in the New ; and that the words we there read are the real, inspired words of God, conveying to man the precepts of his life, and the conditions of his salvation.

But then agreeing so far, we differ immediately after—according to the principle which I suggested as the guide of this discussion all through—the principle of *addition*. Rome goes on, and says, that not only in this holy, inspired, written volume, are to be found the tenets of faith and practice which are necessary to salvation, but also that there are in her possession certain oral communications which are of equal authority, and equally convey God's revelation, and therefore are equally required to be believed, for the salvation of every human soul. We agree then with Rome in one considerable and broad basis of faith,—namely, the inspired canonical books ; and we allow also with them that the uncanonical books, *i. e.* the Apocrypha, may contain useful precepts for instruction in life,—and so we read them in our churches on certain days, with reverence ; but then when the Romanist goes on, and says that oral tradition, together with the Apocrypha, are equally binding on our faith, as conveying God's will in matters essential to salvation,—we then part company : he begins his principle of *adding* to the faith of the Church, and we deny his doctrine.

The subject (as will afterwards be seen to be absolutely necessary, from its very great importance) will be divided into two lectures. The first will be to show the ABUSE *of tradition*, as held in the Church of Rome; the second will be to show the USE *of tradition*, as held in the Church of England.

For the present, we shall be confined to the ABUSE *of tradition*; and herein we shall first have to explain what tradition is, and how it is connected with Scripture; and then point out, according to our plan, the distinctive errors of Romanism, as contrasted with the Church of England.

The meaning of the word *tradition*, in its first sense, is the delivering or handing down of something from one person to another; and this, as is evident, can be done in two ways—by *oral* teaching, and by *written* teaching. Thus St. Paul says (1 *Cor.* xv. 3), “I have *delivered** unto you”—in other words, “I have made a *tradition* to you”—“that Christ died for our sins.” And in another place (1 *Cor.* xi. 2), “Keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you”†—in other words, if literally, “Keep the *traditions* which I have handed down to you.” And in another place (2 *Thess.* ii. 15), “Stand fast, and hold the *traditions*‡ which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.” And here, in this last passage, we find the two

* παρεδωκα.

† παραδοσις.

‡ παραδοσις.

sorts of tradition set in juxtaposition: by word,—that is, *oral*; or by epistle,—that is, *written*.

But the simple meaning of the word in its first sense, soon becomes lost in its secondary or ecclesiastical sense; for by this it becomes confined to the *oral* or *memorial* teaching, as in contra-distinction to the *written*. Written tradition assuming the name of *Scripture*, and *oral* tradition dropping its distinguishing epithet *oral*, and assuming by itself the representation of that sort of teaching which does not depend on writing. Thus, let us clearly understand the two words: Scripture *is* tradition, really speaking, though it has lost the name; but tradition is not Scripture, because it wants the essential addition of being set down in writing. Scripture is tradition, but tradition is not Scripture.

Now this is much more important than you may at first imagine; for you must remember, that long before there was any such thing as Scripture, there *was* tradition. Without tradition, there could have been no Scripture at all. Let us consider. Our blessed Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ was crucified in the year 33. St. Matthew's Gospel was the first Scripture of the New Covenant. Its date is not precisely agreed upon;—some put it as late as 64, others as early as 38; and then the other Scriptures, both Gospels and Epistles, were added from time to time, as circumstances called

for them, down to the close of the first century. Here then we must directly see that there was some period in the history of the Christians, when there were no Scriptures at all ; and a very considerable period before the whole of them were complete. Take the very lowest computation, there must have been a period of *five* years (but this is most likely very short of truth : it was probably fifteen or twenty years) when there was no Scripture at all, and then only one Gospel, circulated among a very scanty number of the Hebrew Christians. On what then during this period, throughout all those Gentile Churches already founded throughout the world, could Christianity depend ? Only on that *oral* teaching, that *remembrance* of doctrines delivered by the preaching of the Apostles, and handed about by word of mouth from one person to another. And this we call *tradition*.

Now this is the only way in which we can speak of creeds. Creeds are traditions. It is supposed that, before Scriptures were known, the Apostles communicated the great truths of salvation in a short form or summary, not exactly the words, but something like, our Apostles' Creed. It is certain that there was among the first Christians *some* apostolical form of words which they repeated, as the symbol of their faith, before holy baptism.* Thus then,—by creeds,

* It is always well when we can obtain testimony from those of any party opposed to ourselves,—for such testimony

by repeating summaries of faith, by sermons, by a little instruction in a doctrine *here*, and more instruction in another doctrine *there*—by degrees Christianity grew up, and flourished, and cities became Churches,—still for many years, let us remember, possessing no Scriptures of the New Testament.* *Tradition*, oral teaching, was all that they had to depend upon.

But it is evident that this could not last long among civilized people, such as were the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, who possessed the art of writing. It was not probable that matter of such momentous importance as human salvation could be left to the uncertain and feeble authority of hearsay. Consider, my brethren, what your religion would be, if it were to depend only on the sermons that you hear. Does not every religious man, although he may be well pleased at receiving this sort of instruction as a help and incentive to his faith and duty, yet

is (as is evident) doubly valuable. *Baxter*, being a Non-conformist, may be taken as an ultra opposer of Romanism, and, therefore, jealous of any of the pretences of tradition beyond its positive and real value. Yet even Baxter is not afraid of making, in regard to creeds as being traditions antecedent to Scripture, the following observations :

“Lastly, no doubt but this practice of the Apostles [using creeds] was exemplary, and imitated by the Churches, and that thus the essentials of religion were by the *tradition of the creed and baptism* delivered by themselves, as far as Christianity went, *long before any book of the New Testament was written.*”—*Baxter, Christian Directory*, part iii. q. cxxxix.

invariably apply to some *book* for his real, main instruction in the doctrines of salvation ?

Suppose, by a sermon delivered in this place, you learn a truth which you did not know before; and you then go and impart that truth to another man, who did not happen to be at church to hear it; and then that man so learning it were to go forward again, and impart it to another; and then again it were to go forward until it passed, we will say, through the hands of twenty persons;—do you think it probable that, however important the truth might have been in my first delivery of it to you,—do you think it probable, from your knowledge of the human heart, its passions, its prejudices, its bias, its inaccuracy, its fickleness, its variableness,—do you think it probable that the truth would arrive at that twentieth person in anything like the form in which it first went forth from the pulpit? Impossible. We know how it is in the delivery of a tradition of the commonest piece of temporal information which we communicate one to another. It is altered, either by subtraction or exaggeration; nay, perhaps quite destroyed, long before it passes through twenty persons' hands. And would it then be likely that God, who knows men and human hearts, would leave a matter of such vast importance as the salvation of the whole human race,—a salvation which had to be made known over the face of the whole world, and among nations of endlessly different languages,—a salvation which

was to endure, as the good tidings of the nations, for more centuries than we can any way calculate (eighteen have already passed)—would it be likely, I repeat, that God would leave such a matter as this to the changing humours of an oral communication? Surely not. We can safely say that the antecedent probability is very much against it.*

But there are other arguments of a more cogent description,—those derived from our knowledge of what God had already done. Is not God consistent, harmonious in all his works, not having in his ways towards the children of men any variableness or shadow of turning? If he has revealed himself in one way towards the children of Israel, would he not be likely to reveal himself in the same way towards the children of the Gentiles? Let us remember, that Judaism and Christianity are but parts of one whole,—that they are not two distinct religions, teaching opposite truths, but one the foundation of the other, leading on even from Abraham and Moses to Jesus Christ. If, then,

* The Romanist will meet us here with an objection, that *the Church* is the keeper of tradition, and that the Church being an infallible guide, and conservator of all things committed to her by God, would take care that tradition should be preserved pure. But we should not be taken aback by this, even for a moment, because we should deny at the outset the assumed *infallibility* of any Church. We should at once say, that no Church can be sure that she is exempt from error. But this will be considered in a subsequent lecture.

in the people of the Jews we behold the Almighty carefully (if we may so say) avoiding all teaching by tradition; if we behold him revealing himself to Moses in the Moral Law, not trusting even him to repeat to the people, by word of mouth, the Ten Commandments, but actually writing or engraving them with his finger on two tables of stone; and when we pursue their history still farther, and find all along that the law of God, and the prophecies of God, and all the history of God's dealings with them, were invariably committed to writing, — is it not a presumption that a traditional teaching is not acceptable in God's sight? For instance, in the book of Deuteronomy it is said of the king who might be appointed over the Israelites, that he should “*write a copy of the law in a book.*” To Jeremiah God himself said, “*Write the words I have spoken in a book.*” When the people returned from their captivity, Ezra began to teach them the law of God; but he did it not from his memory, or from what had been traditionally recorded among them, but he “*read in the book* of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.” To these we might add many other similar examples of the extreme jealousy which appeared among the Jews against anything save that which was written; confirmed afterwards by our Saviour's continual rebuke of the Pharisees, that they had violated this rule, and had encumbered and vitiated what had

been written by their traditions. Put all this together, and then consider whether it would be agreeable with God's consistency in all his works, to make a revelation to the narrow and circumscribed people of a very small territory of the world, by writing; and then to make a revelation which was to apply to *all the world*, by the accident of oral communication. No—we may surely and safely infer that Almighty God—who is consistent in all things, and had decreed, that into the place of the Church of Israel the Church of Christ should succeed, would not leave that Church—his vineyard—his household—his beloved people—the disciples of his own dear Son—at the mercy of such a transient and variable way of learning his will, as the mere oral communication of one man to another. Therefore, although the Christian religion *began*, as I just explained, and, as was natural it should *begin*, with the more exciting and stimulating method of a personal sympathy in the teaching of man to man by word of mouth; yet it soon came to pass, that the same apostles who preached orally, and were Evangelists by preaching, were moved by the Holy Ghost to concentrate and gather together all the great points of such oral preaching, in HOLY SCRIPTURES, and so become Evangelists by writing.*

* The Gospel which the apostles *preached*, afterwards, by the will of God, they delivered to us in the Scriptures."—*Irenæus*, lib. iii. cap. l.

Now from this understanding of the matter we shall observe three important truths.

I. First, we shall observe, that there could be no difference whatever between the Scriptures so written and the traditions previously existing. They were one and the same thing. The Scriptures could not contain one item more, and certainly not one item less, which was necessary to salvation, than had previously been circulated among the early Christians in the shape of creeds, summaries of faith, ceremonial observances, or forms of prayer.

II. Secondly, let us observe, that the Scriptures being thus established by Almighty God, and set forth by the Holy Spirit moving the hearts of different men to record the words and actions of Christ, and the historical records of his Church,—I say, these Scriptures, being thus established and set forward before the world, which they were, we have reason to suppose (at least, the greater portion of them) towards the close of the first century; these Scriptures, so established, could not, by the very nature of things, contain anything which might have been done subsequent to their publication; therefore, if it should ever happen that we find a tradition asserted now by any Christians to be essential to salvation, which is not in Scripture also, we know that it must be a tradition invented subsequently to the apostolic age; but if we find a tradition which agrees with Scripture, or is contained in Scripture, or may be gathered out

of Scripture, then we appreciate and embrace that tradition; but we do so now because Scripture confirms and establishes it, and not because it confirms and establishes Scripture.

III. Thirdly, we shall observe, that the very fact of the traditions being committed to Scripture *at all* invalidates any supposition of traditional teaching being still left among Christians as vital to their salvation. For, it is obvious to ask, why should God command his apostles—why should God the Holy Ghost inspire holy men to record the words and actions of Christ in writing, if, after all, some traditions, as previously existing, had been still necessary to be believed for their salvation? we might as well have been left even to this hour without any Scripture at all. There would be no advantage in Scripture; there would be no benefit to be derived from it. It would be a work (if we might so say with reverence) of supererogation to take out of the great mass of revelation floating among the early Christians—namely, their creeds of the Divinity of the three Persons, Christ's incarnation, death, resurrection, and the like—to take out of this mass of doctrine certain portions of it, at the great cost of wonderful preparation and miraculous interference, and yet leave out other portions of it still necessary to be believed as articles of faith. Surely this is not God's usual way of dealing with man: to do a thing, or cause it to be done, which is inefficient: to use great means, without an end. Therefore,

let me repeat, we may infer that traditions cease to be necessary to salvation, by the mere fact of there being any Scripture at all.

It is thus. Certain things were delivered by oral teaching during the life of Christ, by his apostles. It is impossible to suppose that Christ and his apostles could have taught an *imperfect* system of faith, or could have preached any Gospel but what was sufficient for salvation. All that was required to be taught was taught: then, when the truth was in danger, by remoteness of time, or by transmission through the imperfect channels of human communication, to be changed or mutilated, or added to, he graciously vouchsafed to direct holy men, moved by the Holy Ghost, to write down all that had been said and done that was essential to be known for salvation;—not all that was said and done altogether, for many ceremonies, usages, sayings of Christ, and miracles of Christ, are, it is confessed, left unwritten, as St. John testifies in the last verse of his Gospel: “And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books which should be written:”—not then *all* that was said and done, but all that was necessary to salvation. And this is the point, the great vital point, of distinction in the controversy. We allow beyond question that many things were said and done by Christ which are not in Scripture, but we cannot allow that any of those things *were necessary*

to salvation. And if anything in Scripture can confirm it, it is that remarkable saying of St. John, which stands as our text: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book." It is, as it were, saying, You yourselves know, from the testimony of eye-witnesses, and those that heard the Lord Jesus, that what the gospels and epistles have recorded, are but a selection of what was said and done by him. They pretend to be no more than such selection; but then, he adds, "*These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*" The principle of the selection is this,—"*That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ.*" The selection gives you all that you require; it is needless to give you more. If there is anything to be believed or done by a Christian essential to salvation, *i. e.* "*that you might have life through his name,*" here it is recorded. If there had been anything farther, God would have given it you, even as He has given you this.

Thus then having considered the true nature of tradition, and its bearing and reciprocal value in relation to Holy Scripture, let us now pass on to consider what the two Churches of England and Rome publicly declare.

And, first, our own Church.

There are two articles which specifically treat on this head—the sixth and thirty-fourth.

Strictly speaking, though the word tradition

is mentioned in the thirty-fourth article, it does not apply to our present question; but, as the word does occur there, and some confusion might arise if it were passed by, we must stop for a few moments to explain it. In the thirty-fourth article it is stated, that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be, in all places, one." It evidently signifies no more than the *customs* of a Church. For instance, that we should, at the mention of the name *Jesus*, bow the head; in saying the Creed, that we should turn to the east; that the minister of God should wear a certain ceremonial dress in his public duties; in baptism, that he should make use of the sign of the cross—these are traditions in a lower sense—customs of the Church—things handed down from time out of mind, from father to son, *throughout all ages*—but not matters which affect our salvation. We do not find that the minister of God is commanded in the Scripture to wear a surplice, or to sign persons baptised with the sign of the cross; and we do not believe that his doing so, or his refraining from doing so, would affect either his own salvation, or the salvation of his congregation, or of the baptised person; but they are mere ceremonial observances, and our article says of them, "at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities, of countries, times, and men's manners."

This being understood, let us now look to the sixth article, wherein the real question is at once

set forth. This article distinctly states, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, and proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite, or necessary to salvation." By these words, as plainly as by any words which could be put together, we exclude such traditions as are not contained in Scripture from having anything to do with our faith. Ceremonial traditions, the thirty-fourth article states, we may have, but traditions necessary to salvation the sixth article states that we are not to have, except such traditions be contained in, and proved by, Scripture. But although this article is the only one which specifically treats on the subject, yet we can see the spirit of our Church breathing the same doctrine all through the articles, and perhaps this is a more conclusive way of judging than any other. So jealous is she of any interpolation by tradition, that upon any the slightest occasion this spirit bursts forth. For instance, in the eighth article, speaking of the creeds (which we before explained to be traditions), she says that they ought to be "thoroughly received and believed." But, why? Because, "they may be proved by most certain warranty of *Holy Scripture*." Again, in the seventeenth article, on Predestination, speaking of the promises of God, how they ought to be received, she says, that they ought to be "received in such wise as they be generally set forth in *Holy Scripture*; and,

in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we find *expressly* declared unto us in the *Word of God*." In the eighteenth article, speaking of our obtaining salvation, Jesus Christ is said to be the only name by which we can do so. Why? Because "*Holy Scripture* doth set it out." In the twentieth, it is said of the Church, that she may not "ordain anything contrary to God's word written,"—where *written* seems to be added after *word*, for fear of accidental mistake, or embracing tradition under God's word; and then, the article proceeding, though it acknowledge the Church as the keeper of Holy *Writ*, yet declares that "as it ought not to decree anything *against* the same," so, *besides* the same, *i.e.* in addition to the same (which is the very thing the Romanist does), it ought not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation. So, in the twenty-first article, general councils may not decree anything unless it be "taken out of *Holy Scripture*." So in the twenty-second, six errors of Romanism are denounced upon this plain reason, that they are not grounded upon any *warranty of Scripture*. So in the twenty-fifth, public prayer in the Church, in an unknown language, is denounced, because it is repugnant to the *Word of God*. So also in the twenty-eighth and thirty-fourth, similar annunciations may be found.

Therefore, consider herein what a mass of evidence we have in our formal and deliberate articles, set forth in opposition to Rome, of the

jealousy of our Church against the interpolations of tradition.

Again, if we go from the articles to the Book of Homilies, we shall find similar testimony. In the first homily, "Of the Holy Scriptures," we shall find it thus:—"There is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is or may be drawn out of that fountain and well of truth." And a little after, "Therefore forsaking the corrupt judgment of fleshly men, which care not but for their carcase, let us reverently hear and read Holy Scriptures, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions."

Lastly, let us look to our Book of Common Prayer, and more particularly the Ordination Service. When the presbyter stands at the altar, in the presence of the bishop, to receive holy orders;—before laying on of hands, this question is asked of him:—"Are you persuaded that Holy Scripture contains sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ; and are you determined out of the said Scripture to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by Scripture?" Answer: "I am persuaded and have so determined by God's grace."

All this is the authoritative public teaching of our Church. To all this every presbyter of the Church has solemnly subscribed and set

his hand and seal, under an oath to God. Consider the careful, wary expressions of the question put at ordination. Consider the answer made there by me, and by all others of the presbytery at a time most solemn, most deliberate, after due examination, continued study, frequent prayer, then finally sealed by the holy communion of the Lord's body and blood; and then consider, my brethren, within yourselves, what sort of charge that is that you lightly and wantonly make against the pastors of the flock, when you say that they are teaching you contrary to the Bible, and leading you to the superstitions of Romanism.

But now, turning to the Roman Church, let us investigate *their* public and authoritative teaching. There is, says that Church, with us and in our keeping, certain communications from God, besides the Scriptures. These private, unwritten communications it is necessary to believe, in order to be saved. These communications were given by Jesus Christ to his apostles, and his apostles have handed them down to us; and we have them now. You may read your Bible ever so much, and yet, if you believe not what these traditions say, you will be damned.

In order to feel sure that this *is* the real teaching of the Church of Rome, we must look to their *decrees* and *councils*. And though these decrees and councils are shaped very cautiously and ambiguously (for an evident reason), yet when we know the practical teaching of the

Church which illustrates these councils,—when we know what is said and done by them in their precepts and in their worship,—we are quite sure that this is really their meaning, and that they wish to make, and do make, tradition equivalent to Scripture.

In the fourth council of Constantinople (A.D. 869), we find the opinions and definitions of the holy fathers spoken of as “*secondary oracles*,” as “lamps always shining and enlightening our steps which are after God;” and it is said, “Therefore we profess to preserve and keep the rules which have been delivered to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as well by the holy and most illustrious Apostles, as by the universal and local councils of the orthodox, or even by any *divinely speaking* father and master of the Church.”*

All this is very well. Tradition MAY be a light and lamp, commenting on and explaining Scripture; they may become “*secondary oracles*,” and if the Church of Rome had said no more than this, there could have been no great mischief. Going on, however, to the council of Trent—which, we know, was the great council of the Romanists, declaring their opinions against the Reformation, and which Reformation, we also know, was based upon the principle of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation—going on, I say, to the council of Trent (A.D. 1546), we find these expressions.

* Conc. Constant. Canon I.

After speaking of the Gospel preached by our Lord Jesus Christ, and communicated to his apostles, as the source of all saving truth and moral discipline,—the council then goes on to declare that this truth and discipline (*i. e.* this *Gospel*) is contained in written books, *and in unwritten tradition*; and then afterwards she declares, that she “venerates with the same affection and reverence all the books of the Old and New Testament, since one God is the author of both; *and also traditions themselves relating both to faith and morals.*”* Now here, in the first paragraph, let us observe that we are speaking of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The *Gospel* must be that which is necessary to be believed, as essential to salvation. Yet it is said of this Gospel necessary to salvation, that it is contained in *unwritten tradition, as well as in written books*; and then in the second paragraph, this tradition, so conveying the Gospel, is spoken of as an object of *equal* affection and reverence with the books of the Old and New Testament. If we go on from this public and authoritative teaching of the Church to private writers, we shall find of course abundant places where this doctrine is worked out even more fully;† and if we go on still farther to the daily

* Conc. Trident. Session iv.

† Bellarmine, Salmeron, Pope Pius IV, &c. Serjeant, the author of a book entitled *Sure Footing*, goes so far as to speak of the sacred writings, if severed from tradition, as “ink variously figured in a book, unsensed characters, waxen-

practices of their Church, we shall find all sorts of doctrines imposed upon the faith of the people, which they themselves acknowledge are nowhere found in Scripture. Indeed, they make no pretence that they are; they do not hide the matter. It is a thing they do not hesitate to confess, because they take their ground without any doubt whatever that the traditions which they have in their possession—secret traditions, apostolical or ecclesiastical, made so either by decrees of councils or by decisions of Pope or otherwise,—in one word, the external and additional teaching of the Church, besides the Scripture,—are binding on the minds and souls of their people.

Thus there is a difference between us, which never can be healed;—at least, to all human appearance. The ground on which we stand is taken from under our feet. It is vain to argue, or to appeal to *authority*,—for *our* authority is not theirs. While our authority is immutable, ever the same, and openly known, theirs is continually shifting, never alike, secret, taking different colours and complexions, as suits the opportunity. Ours is the rock which, let the waves of the ocean dash over it with all the winds of heaven, is but the same, when all their fury is exhausted; but theirs, the *sand*,

natured words, not yet sensed, nor having any certain interpreter, fit to be played upon diversely by quirks of wit, apt to blunder and confound, but to clear little or nothing.” (!)

of which every tide of the sea ebbing and flowing alters the shape and colour.

Scripture is the same now, we may say in general terms, that it was seventeen hundred years ago. We read the very same words that the first Christians did, when the evangelists wrote down the words of the Holy Ghost for their edification and instruction. The same words which Irenæus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement, and hosts of holy bishops and martyrs, read with their own eyes, we read now; and as they appealed to them for the proof of their faith, so we; as they were comforted by them, so we; as they learned God's will from them, so we;—the same even as it was said of Christ himself, yesterday, to-day, and for ever.* But for *traditions* of Rome, that

* Besides the earlier Fathers, which are numerous, take even the following subsequent to the third century, to show how very long in the Church the appeal to Scripture was considered the orthodox proof of faith:

Athanasius. (A.D. 326.) Having enumerated the Canonical Books: "These are fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied. In these *alone* the doctrines of salvation are proclaimed; let no man add to them, or take anything from them." And again: "The sacred and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient to show us the truth."—*Festal Epistle ad finem.*

Cyril of Jerusalem. (A.D. 348.) "Trust no word, unless thou dost learn it from Holy Scriptures. It behoves us not to deliver so much as *the least thing* of the divine and holy mysteries of faith without the divine Scriptures."—*Catech. xii. Illum.*

Basil. (A.D. 370.) "Every word and every thing ought

which was believed yesterday is not believed to-day, and that which is believed to-day is not believed to-morrow. Things spring up as the custom of an hour, from some enthusiastic or powerful individual, and then a few persons believe and do what he has begun; and years roll on, and it becomes *tradition*—and then years roll on, and it dies away. The Assumption of the Virgin Mary, *i. e.* the taking up of the body of the Virgin Mary after death into heaven, is esteemed now an apostolical tradition, and yet it cannot be traced any higher than St. Augustin, in the latter part of the fourth century. The communicating of infants in the Lord's Supper prevailed for many ages (600 years), and was

to be made credible or believed by the testimony of the divinely inspired Scripture.”—*Ethic. Definit.* 26.

Jerome. (A.D. 392.) “Everything which we say, we ought to prove from Scripture.”—*In Psalm.* lxxxix.

Rufinus. (A.D. 395.) After giving a catalogue of the Scriptures: “These are the volumes which the fathers have included in the canon, and out of which they would have us prove the doctrines of our faith.”—*Expositio in Symbol. Apostolorum.*

Theodoret. (A.D. 423.) “Do not bring me your arguments; I rely only upon the Scriptures.”—*Dial.* i. c. vi.

Cosmas of Alexandria. (A.D. 535.) “Upon the whole, it does not become a perfect Christian to endeavour to confirm anything by doubtful books, when the books of the Testament, acknowledged by all, have sufficiently declared all things needful to be known concerning the heavens, and the earth, and the elements, and the whole Christian doctrine.”—*Lib.* vii. p. 292.

How very modern then must be the additions of Rome!

esteemed an apostolical tradition ; but now it is gone, and no longer found among the Romanists. The custom of making vows and prayers to saints, is now practised in the Church of Rome, but even Cardinal Bellarmine (who was one of the great controversial defenders of the Church of Rome) even he allows, that “ when the Scriptures were written, the use of vowing to saints was not begun ;” and Perron also says, that “ in the authors near the apostolic age no such custom can be found.”

Thus, where are we ? Without *Scripture*, we are at sea : depending on human authority, we never can be safe. We may be quite sure, that what Almighty God in his goodness has conveyed to us as his *will*, written in the words of the Old and New Testament, is sufficient, and contains all things necessary to salvation.

“ We receive and embrace all the canonical Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, and we give our gracious God most hearty thanks that he hath set up this light for us,—which we ever fix our eyes upon, lest by human fraud, and the means of the devil, we should be seduced to errors or fables. We own them to be the heavenly voices by which God hath revealed and made known his will. In them only can the mind of man acquiesce ; in them all that is necessary for our salvation is abundantly and plainly contained, as Origen, St. Augustin, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril, have taught us.

“ They are the very might and power of God

unto salvation ; they are the foundations of the apostles and prophets, upon which the Church of God is built ; they are the most certain and infallible rule, by which the Church may be reduced, if she happen to stagger, slip, or err, and by which all ecclesiastical doctrines ought to be tried. No law, no tradition, no custom, is to be received or continued if it be contrary to Scripture ; no, though St. Paul himself, or an angel from heaven, should come and teach otherwise.”*

* Jewel's Apology, § 10.

SERMON IV.

JOHN xx. 31.

“And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.”

THE abuse of Tradition by the Church of Rome was the subject on which we were employed in the last lecture. But because we there stated our opinion most unreservedly, and in no measured terms, on the unwise and unlawful authority with which the Church of Rome has invested tradition, it does not follow by any means that tradition is to be cast out of the Church altogether. Far from it. Because some medicines consist of poisons, and if administered improperly would *destroy* life, it by no means follows that we are to cast them aside altogether. On the contrary, by a right employment of them we might *save* life. Their value does not consist in their mere existence, nor is their value diminished by their improper use by others. Their value

consists in a right and legitimate use of them, —a use limited by the time and circumstances of their exhibition. Just so in tradition. Because Rome has unjustly magnified it, and used it where it ought not to be used, it by no means follows but that *we* (under God's grace) may turn it to a good account, and help ourselves by it in the search after those divine truths which are essential to our salvation.

Now it is very important to us to have a clear understanding of the use of tradition, because there are many things in our religion which, if we had it not, we should have very imperfectly known. If we did not recognize tradition in some degree, we should have very great difficulty in replying both to the Dissenter on the one hand, and to the Romanist on the other; but more especially to the Romanist, with whom our present question lies. For might not the Romanist argue very strongly against us from the historical facts which we are compelled to admit? Might he not say: "Considering what was agreed upon in the last lecture, and which no man can help agreeing to — that traditional or oral teaching must have preceded Scripture for many years — that all through our Lord's life, and for a considerable period of the apostles' teaching after his death, there could only have been the preaching of the Gospel by word of mouth; — considering that it was many years before the Scriptures were

collected together and made canonical, and yet that many Churches had in the meantime been formed, had grown up, and were flourishing ;— considering all these points, which are facts not to be denied, what becomes of your consistency, if, in zeal without knowledge, you broadly assert that tradition is of no use whatever ?” Exactly so. We anticipate the Romanist then, and defeat him in such an argument, by allowing that there *is* a use in it. And remember, my brethren, this is one of the most specious arguments which are brought against us by him. It is one of the arguments which has so fatally misled and deceived so many many unstable souls, causing them to forsake the true Church, and become Romanists. It is thus : A person on our side, full of determined zeal against Popery, impregnated with that deep hostility which we all so justly bear against her innovations, and full of admiration of that bountiful mercy of God in giving us His holy written Word, runs headlong, and without consideration, against *tradition*, imagining it to be, without any distinction, the sole peculiarity of the abominations of Rome. He will not have anything to be called a source of teaching, in any degree whatsoever, but the Bible ; he will not believe anything as an article of faith, unless it be in Scripture words. What is the consequence ? The Romanist, some day or other, meets him, and insidiously grants his point ; and then, so granting it, immediately takes him up,

and demonstrates to him the historical facts just detailed, which he had not in his hurry paid any attention to. Then having done so, he points out to him such a text as this, in the last verse of St. John's gospel : " There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books which should be written ;" and upon this he would insinuate : *might* there not have been among these things which were confessed to be by St. John left unwritten, many important points of instruction, and many points of discipline, which our Lord commended to the keeping of his Church ?—*might* there not have been ?—Of course, we cannot prove a negative ; so then he would go on to say : " Not only *might* there have been, but when you consider other parts of Scripture, it is very probable, indeed, that there were. For instance, St. Paul to the Corinthians says, ' Keep the traditions which I delivered ;' and to Timothy, ' Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me.' " Thus he would go on, and conclude : " Scripture, therefore, seems to say that the things which the evangelists and others left unwritten might be of equal authority with the Scripture itself." Now how would the mind which started with such zealous denunciations against tradition, when once overthrown by the admission of the historical facts when put before him, stand all

these insinuations? It is evident he would be overwhelmed. Having in the outset stated too much, he would have nothing to reply when so convinced. He would give all up. He would draw no distinction, but would yield, and in all probability end in Romanism. But far otherwise, if at the starting place tradition is allowed, but marked, divided, and made distinct by definition. Far otherwise, if he recognized tradition as our Church recognizes it, but no farther. Then he would see through all the stratagems of his antagonist in a moment. He would perceive that all these insinuations depended upon mere sophistry; upon an omission all though of this important qualifying clause, "NECESSARY TO SALVATION." We do not say that there *might* have been,—we say that there *were*, many things,—many things of instruction, many things of custom, many things of discipline, which were not written. How can we deny it, when St. John positively says so? No doubt there were such things; but allowing this most fully, we do not see why those things should be "*necessary to salvation.*" On the contrary, we argue from the fact of there being any Scripture at all subsequent to tradition, that that Scripture must contain all things necessary to salvation, otherwise God would have been doing a thing which was useless. We are prepared then to allow many things unwritten, but nothing unwritten worthy to be believed as "*necessary to salvation.*"

Now it will be seen that all this depends upon a right and clear line to be drawn across this out-set of the question. We do not deny tradition. We know its place and its use ; but, like a sharp weapon, we handle it warily, and keep it where it ought to be kept. We do not differ with the Romanist here. It is not in the mere *fact* of tradition that his distinctive error begins ; but upon his asserting that it contains things *independantly* of Scripture, and *equally* with Scripture “ *necessary to salvation.*”

And now with this understanding let us proceed to the articles of our Church, our creeds and formularies, our doctrines and customs ; and analyze in them the use which we make of tradition. All things necessary to salvation rest only on Scripture. But in what way do they rest ? Not directly or determinedly, and in so many words found there ; but gathered, or collected, or inferred, or proved by it. And if you will carefully observe our sixth article, you will find that it does not assert every article of faith which we believe to be found in so many words in Scripture ; but this : “ Holy Scripture *containeth* all things necessary to salvation (has *within* it) ; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be *proved thereby*, is not to be required of any man to be believed as an article of the faith.” And the eighth article upon the creeds speaks in the same language : “ The three Creeds are altogether to be received

and believed, for they can be *proved* by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." This article does not state that the points of faith contained in the creeds are each of them to be found in so many words in the Bible, but only that they are to be collected or inferred out of it, and rest for their authority upon it. The difference then is this. Certain points are given us as articles of faith. The Church of England says: "We must not resort to tradition to *prove* them (although we may use it as a help) but only to Scripture." Whereas the Romanist says: "You may resort equally well either to tradition or to Scripture, to prove your faith; it matters not which." I hope this is clearly understood, because it is a very important distinction. Let us now proceed to show *why* it is important.

I. The first great point in which the use of tradition must be evident to all, is this: *that the Scriptures ARE the Scriptures*. How do we know that St. Matthew's Gospel *is* St. Matthew's Gospel? that St. Paul really wrote the epistles which bear his name? that the Acts of the Apostles is really a canonical and divine book, and contains the words of the Holy Ghost? In short, how do we know that the New Testament, in all its parts, and as a whole, is really the thing which it is represented and called? There are evidently no Scriptures to prove this, and Scripture cannot prove itself. It rests upon tradition. There is a uni-

versal traditional record, in all times, and in all places, and among all men, both the enemies as well as the friends of Christianity, which allows, and always has allowed, that these books are the Christian Scriptures, written by those holy men whose names they bear. But if we put aside this traditional evidence, upon what have we to rest? How could we combat the Romanist, who would immediately seize upon this weak point, and so undermine all our faith? It is plain, even from this, that tradition must not altogether be cast aside.

II. But let this pass. If we are satisfied that Scripture is Scripture,—that is, that our Bibles, as we possess them now, do contain God's real word,—which is, I suppose, a question which we need not enter upon now,—if in this we are satisfied, then let me mark out to you a few things which I do not think you could, or any Christian could, have found out for himself in that Bible,—things which I do not imagine would have been articles of our faith, so peremptorily pronounced as they are, had not there been such a thing as tradition, or the teaching of the Church. For instance, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Is it possible, my brethren, do you think, that *you*, or *I*, or anyone, be he ever so gifted with the powers of man, could have deduced and invented for himself this most wonderful and mysterious doctrine out of the Bible? There is no mention of the

Trinity in Unity to be found in Scripture, in so many direct words.* That God is one and yet three, three and yet one, is not said in so many distinct words anywhere in the Bible. And yet it is a most vital doctrine. We have always had it in the Church. There is no creed in Christianity where it is not an article of faith. We were born to it, taught it by our parents, instructed in it by the Church, baptised into it, and believe it;—*how* then do we possess it? We find it among us, as given by *tradition*. But we do not rest in tradition; we set to work to prove it. We do not believe it only because it is a tradition, but because it is confirmed by Scripture, and proved to be contained in it. It is contained in the apostolic blessing in the form of baptism,—in the fact of the presence of the three persons of the Godhead at the baptism of Jesus in the river Jordan. By these and such like inferential facts we are satisfied of the doctrine; but certainly any candid mind would allow that he could not of himself have detected it in the Bible, unless he had been led to

* There is indeed one text which seems to prove this doctrine, —namely 1 *John* v. 7: “There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.” If this text were unanimously allowed to be genuine, a great deal might be inferred from it; but unfortunately it is generally considered to be an interpolation, not being found in a single Greek manuscript written before the sixteenth century. We cannot, therefore, fairly rely upon it in any controversial point.

it by the teaching of the Church in her creed and other traditions. If indeed, after we had been led to it, we should have found it contrary to Scripture, we should have cast it aside, however much a tradition it might have been; but when upon examination it is found agreeing with Scripture, then we believe it. Here then is a point in which tradition is useful,—*apostolical, divine* tradition,—ascertained only to be apostolical and divine, by being “*contained*,” not in so many words, but being “*contained in*,” and “*proved by*,” the Holy Scriptures.

III. Let us take another instance—*Infant Baptism*. I do not imagine that any person unprepared by previous custom, would, upon a perusal of the mere letter of Scripture, assert, that that Scripture wished infants to be baptised. There is no direct assertion of this doctrine to be found anywhere. But we find it to be the custom of the great body of Christians in all countries and in all early times. Our fathers baptised us as infants, and their fathers baptised them, and going back, we find that this custom prevailed up to the very apostolic ages. This is tradition;—we owe it then to tradition. But how do we prove it to be right? By seeing if we can find any traces of it in Scripture. Though not exactly commanded, yet we shall certainly find in Scripture some traces of it if it be a true doctrine. We search therefore, and we infer it, as by the corresponding rite of

circumcision at eight days old under the Jewish law,—as by Christ suffering little children to come unto Him and forbidding them not,—by St. Paul's baptising the households of Lydia, Stephanas, and the jailor, at Philippi; in which households there must have been children,—by the improbability of there being any limit to the persons to be baptised—when our Saviour's commission was, “Go ye and teach *all nations*, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” All this is exceedingly satisfactory in proving the doctrine, when once it is delivered to us;—but I think it may very fairly be said, that, without the traditional observance of the Church throughout the world leading us to it, there would not be anything so decisive for us, that in case we had not found the tradition we could of ourselves have deduced it.

iv. Again,—in the observance of the Lord's Day. If we were to look, however carefully, through Scripture, we should find no direct command that the Jewish sabbath or seventh day of the week, was to be changed as the day of rest and holiness, to the first day or Sunday: we find it nowhere mentioned, and yet this is a universal Christian custom;—we find that our fathers did it,—and they find that their fathers did it,—and so on, until we come to the apostles,—and then we find that the apostles did it. But this is tradition. Now, the question is, are we right in fol-

lowing this tradition. Why have we deviated from the confessed, literal, *written* commandment of the law of God, which bids men to keep holy the seventh day? On tradition. But, are we satisfied to do it merely because we find it a traditional custom? No, if it were opposed to anything in the Christian Scriptures, we should give up the tradition, but we do not find anything opposed to it. On the contrary, we find very strong traces in Scripture of the tradition being true,—and searching Scripture with this understanding already imparted to us, we then can easily infer and deduce arguments by which we are quite convinced of being in the right. First, we find, as a great leading principle given us by St. Paul, that the things of the law were altogether but shadows of the things of the Gospel, and therefore a change from the seventh to another day is not unaccountable. And then we learn as another principle from our Lord himself, that “the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath,” and therefore he would have power and authority to change the day. From these principles we go on to actual facts, and readily trace out that the early Christians did make Sunday their Holy Day, and Day of Public Prayer, as in the fact of our Lord appearing to them on the day of His Resurrection and finding them on the first day of the week assembled together,—the same thing eight days after,—the same thing on the day of Pentecost,

when God vouchsafed one of the greatest miracles of Christianity—so seeming to mark the day as the great day of the week for the things of public religion and worship. All this we learn indeed from Scripture, and it is a proof to us that the tradition of the Lord's Day is right, and it confirms our usage. But after all, by any candid and impartial mind it will be confessed, that all the arguments are only *inferential*, and that, had it not been for the apostolical and traditional usage among all Christians from time out of mind, we should not at this day have deduced it for ourselves out of Scripture.

v. So to continue shortly, there are many similar points, particularly two or three very important ones in our creeds. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity I have already mentioned; but in addition to this, let us consider the doctrine of "*Christ's descent into hell*," as in the Apostles' Creed. No one could say that he would, out of his own original mind, have deduced that article of faith from the Bible. It is nowhere mentioned, in so many words, in the Holy Scriptures; but there is an apostolical tradition that it was so; and having the tradition, we then can deduce it from Scripture. So with the "*Holy Catholic Church*,"—so with the "*Communion of Saints*," both in the Apostles' Creed; and so with the article of "*the procession of the Holy Ghost*," as in the Nicene Creed—"I believe in the Holy

Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who *proceedeth from the Father and the Son.*" All these doctrines are to be found, not in so many words in Scripture, but are given us by universal tradition, and afterwards, being examined by God's Holy Word, are found true. They thus fulfil the meaning of our sixth article, as being worthy of belief, because "*contained in*" and "*proved by,*" Holy Scripture.

Thus then, I hope, that the use and value of tradition must be plain to you,—keeping it quite clear of the *abuse* of it, as before explained, in the Romish Church. That this explanation of it is the true one, we could bring many testimonies from the divines of the Reformed Catholic Church of England, but time will not allow this,—I shall confine myself to *two* authors of very different, opposite sentiments.

When we can bring evidence from an enemy, that evidence is more valuable than from a friend, because we feel sure there can be no interested motive for delivering it. When we can bring evidence from two persons violently opposing each other in many material points, and yet find a point of agreement—that point of agreement is doubly strong as worthy of observation. This evidence, then, I shall bring from two very conspicuous authors,—the one, *Hooker*—the great champion of our Church against the Nonconformists; the other, *Baxter*—the greatest perhaps of the Nonconformist divines. They both assert

most carefully the exact position which tradition must hold in the Church, according to the view I have just been explaining. With passages from these two authors, I shall conclude this branch of the subject. In Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," we find him thus speaking :—" Albeit, Scripture do profess to contain in it all things that are necessary to salvation ; yet, the meaning cannot be, simply of all things which are necessary, but all things that are necessary in some certain kind or form ; as, all things which are necessary, and either could not all, or could not easily be known by the light of natural discourse ; all things which are necessary to be known *that we may be saved* ; but known with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain principles whereof it receiveth us already persuaded, and then instructeth us in all that is necessary. In the number of these principles one is—*the sacred authority of Scripture*. Being, therefore, persuaded by others that these Scriptures are the oracles of God, themselves do teach us the rest, and lay before us all the duties which God requireth at our hands, as necessary unto salvation. Farther, there has been some doubt likewise whether *containing in Scripture* do import, express setting down in plain terms, or else *comprehending* in such sort, that by reason we *may thence conclude* all things which are necessary. Against the former of these two ways [*i.e.* setting down in plain terms], instance has in

sundry ways been given. For our belief in the Trinity, the co-eternity of the Son of God with His Father—the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father and the Son—the baptising infants—these, with such other principal points, the necessity whereof is by none denied, are, notwithstanding, *in Scripture no where to be found by express literal mention, only deduced* they are out of Scripture by collection.” In this passage he is evidently arguing against that sort of dissent which would make a private judgment of Scripture, and so deny all doctrines but those which were positively, and in direct terms, asserted. Then he goes on in a passage shortly afterwards, taking a contrary defence against Romanism, which would so magnify tradition, as to set it above Scripture. And, he says:—“It sufficeth, therefore, that nature and Scripture do serve in such full sort, that they both jointly, and not severally, either of them, be so complete, that unto everlasting felicity we need not the knowledge of anything more than these two may easily furnish; and, therefore, they which *add traditions* as a part of supernatural necessary truth, have not the truth, but are in error.”*

Thus much for our great divine, Hooker. Let us now turn to a very different person, *Baxter*. And before we do so, consider whether a man, representing a party such as the Nonconformist in the time of

* Book I. p. 28, folio.

Oliver Cromwell, would be likely to say anything in favour of *Popery*? Is it at all probable that a man representing a party which would abolish the use of the surplice because it was *like* Popery,—that would pull down, and did pull down and desecrate all the beautiful ornaments of our churches and chancels, because they were *like* Popery,—would in his writings bring forward anything in favour of tradition, unless he were positively forced to do so by the essential compulsion of truth—unless he knew perfectly well that however wrong the Papists were in their perversion and abuse of tradition, yet that very many of the principal points of the Catholic faith would be overwhelmed, unless (in the sense I have now been describing) tradition should be allowed as a help or comment on those Holy Scriptures which we all so dearly love?

In the *Christian Directory* it is thus said:—“No doubt but this practice of the apostles (having creeds) was exemplary, and imitated by the Churches; and that thus the essentials of religion were by the tradition of the creed and baptism, delivered by themselves, as far as Christianity went, long before any book of the New Testament was written.”* Again, in another book, called “*The Unreasonableness of Infidelity*,” he says:—“If we could only prove the tradition of the

* *Christian Directory*, Question 139, vol. v. p. 530.

canonical Scriptures from the apostles' days to ours, we should thereby prove the tradition of the Christian religion therein expressed, namely, that this is the faith once delivered to the saints ; if we could only prove the tradition and use of the said Church forms—the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue, though we had not seen the Scriptures, nor could prove its tradition or incorruption,—yet, should we fully prove the tradition of the Christian religion, so that the being of the Christian religion is not shaken *if the Scripture were unknown.*" "In the Creed, Lord's Prayer, Commandments, and Baptism, was the substance of the Christian religion so delivered, that men were saved by it before the Scripture was seen (I mean the New Testament),—and thousands might, for ought we know, be saved by it after, that knew not the Scripture ; and yet was not the Scripture therefore unnecessary, or less excellent ; for the sum of religion enough to the being of Christianity, and so much as may save, might by tradition be preserved from age to age, in a form of words, yea, though *there had been no writing in the world.*"* Then, in another place, fearing lest his speaking thus of tradition might be misconstrued by some, he says, in the form of a question :—"But doth not this laying so much on tradition favour Popery? No ; the difference is here :—1. Papists are for tradition, as a supple-

* Vol. xx. p. 88-92.

ment to the Scripture, as if this were but part of the word of God ; and, 2. *They* plead for a peculiar favour of being the keepers and judges of that supplemental tradition, which other Churches know nothing of; but *we* plead for the infallible practical tradition of the essentials of Christianity by itself, as in the Creed, &c., which is less than the Scripture ; and next, for the certain tradition of the Scripture itself, uncorrupted in all that faith depends on.”*

I am sure, my brethren, that I need not add more. Any misunderstanding of the line to be drawn between Romanist tradition and the Catholic tradition, would, I hope, after this, be impossible. The only record of our faith is the Scripture. The only record of our Lord’s teaching is the Scripture. The only document of proof to which we can appeal for the truth of what we believe is *the Scripture*. Tradition may tell us a thousand things, which, not being found in Scripture, we reject,—and then it is a *false* tradition ; but it may also tell us a few things, which, being found in Scripture, we believe,—and then it is a *true* tradition. But Scripture is the court of appeal. Tradition may take us to Scripture, to assert the truth of a doctrine, which might have been in Scripture all the time, and yet we never should

* Appendix. A Breviate of the Helps of Faith, &c. vol. xviii. p. 443

have found it, had not tradition taken us there.* She is a handmaid, a guide, an interpreter of Scripture ; but that does not make her the rule of faith. Tradition is the servant, not the master ;—she is the shadow, not the substance :—but very often the shadow may guide us, if we have our senses, as to the size of the substance from which it is cast, therefore not entirely to be thrown aside. It was in this way the fathers of the Church of Christ universal ever used it. It was in this way the Reformers of our branch of the Church universal ever used it. Start a new doctrine—invent a new heresy—and we can at once stop you, by a simple appeal to tradition—*Was it ever so?* If not, then you must be wrong in believing what no Christian ever believed before. For instance, say that there can be a Church without ordained ministers. *Was it ever so?* In the time of the fourth, third, or second century, was it so? In the time of the apostles was it so? No: then you must have been *inventing* something or *adding*—in some way you must be wrong. Then going to Scripture, you find such to be the case. Say, that to baptise infants is wrong: we appeal to

* Thus Bishop Pearson says: “Look then for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace the first faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide than the Creed, received in all ages of the Church, and to this I refer you, as it *leads you to the Scriptures*.”—*Pearson on the Creed, Epistle Dedicatory.*

tradition. It was so in our fathers' time,—it was so in their fathers' time. It was so in the tenth century,—it was so in the fifth century,—it was so in the second century. It was so in the *apostles' time*,—therefore, we are right, unless it can be shown that we violate thereby some especial direction of Scripture. But, it cannot be shown,—therefore, we are right.

Thus, all along, the holy fathers, of all times, speak. They *hinder* controversy by appealing to tradition, but they *decide* controversy by appealing to *Scripture*. Let us not then be afraid, when we speak of tradition, provided we exactly know what we mean by it. Let not the pastors of the flock be accused of *Romanism*, or be slandered by any of the absurd party names which foolish men have invented to disturb the principles and weaken the strength of our holy Catholic Church. Let not all be feared—let not all be suspected—because there may have been injudicious excess in some. We know what our articles say; and we are not perjured men, so as to deliberately profess the faith of the Church of England, and then mutilate it by Jesuitical sophisms. We know what our Church professes in her creeds and formularies, and we are not appointed ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, our Master and Head (who knoweth that we lie not), so as to forget the work of our solemn ordination. Oh, no, my brethren,

though we may fortify ourselves by all sorts of arguments and defences for your instruction and edification in the faith, short of Scripture,—though we may bring out of our treasure, as our Lord commands us, “things new and old,”—though we may appeal to *Nature*, to *Science*, to *Art*, to *Reason*,—and, among the many other tributary handmaids to the truth—to TRADITION,—yet, we are not Papists thereby, nor do we any irreverence to Scripture. God forbid. For with the holy fathers of old, it is Scripture only which is the arbiter,—Scripture only which is the judge,—Scripture only which is the proof, in all differences and disputes, and to that only we appeal.

Let us beseech you, then, to be of good courage in these days of strife and discomfort; to keep your confidence, however things may appear, steadfast unto the end, in the appointed bishops and pastors of the flock; knowing that they cannot interpret God’s word, save by the Church’s witness,—and that she cannot lead you wrong while she is the faithful keeper of Holy Writ. Against the novelties and additions of Rome, set your faces like a flint,—but keep steadfastly the usages and the doctrines of your own Church, knowing that for any tradition held among you essential to salvation, you have its proof in Holy Scripture.

If you have any doubts, here resolve them; if

you fear any false prophets among you, here try them ; if you imagine any wolves in sheep's clothing among you, here detect them ; if any contentions arise, or any disputes, by reason of the gainsayers, or any heresies, or any schisms—whatsoever they be—try them fearlessly by the Word of God, and by the Church, its keeper and witness.

Optatus, fourteen hundred years ago, spoke very much as we might speak in these harassing times. He said, "If differences arise, go to Scripture." He said, "Let no one trust you or me either, we are all of us party men. Arbiters must be found ; but, if they be Christians, such are not fairly producible on either side, for truth suffers by our private prejudices. If we go out of doors for an arbiter, he must be a pagan, so, unacquainted with our mysteries ; or a Jew, who is necessarily the enemy of Christian baptism. It follows, that no human tribunal can be found,—we must have recourse to heaven. But why knock at heaven's gate, when we bear with us a testament in the Gospel. It is like the case of a man with a large family : while the father is alive, he gives his orders to each of them ; Christ, in like manner, during his abode on earth, laid his commands on the apostles, as though that was necessary : but when a father feels himself to be dying, and fears, after his death, his sons should quarrel and go to law, he summons witnesses, and transfers his will from

his heart, to tablets which shall endure ; so that if afterwards a quarrel arise between the brothers, they have recourse not to his tomb, but to his testament ; and thus he, who rests in his tomb, yet speaks (though without voice) from his *writing*. Now HE, whose testament we speak of, is above in heaven ; therefore HIS will must be sought for, as in a testament,—so in the GOSPEL.” *

* Optatus de Schism. Don. v. 3.

SERMON V.

COLOSSIANS I. 18.

“HE is the head of the body—the Church.”

THERE seems scarcely any subject connected with religion, upon which such vague and ill-defined notions prevail, as that of THE CHURCH. What it is—upon what authority it depends—what power it possesses—how we belong to it—what is the use of belonging to it—above all, what the difference is between Rome and England—all these are questions which appear, from the general conversation even of religious and well educated persons, and much more from the general conversation of the world, to present to them no solid ground of information, but to be lost in obscurity and doubt. We shall do well, then, to take this subject as the next in order for discussion, bearing in mind, that we do not desire to enter into any of the scholastic subtleties, which have been involved by controversial writers in this question,

but only to endeavour to set before you certain leading prominent truths, sufficient for ordinary purposes, and sufficient to mark out clearly the great and dangerous principles of addition, which Rome has here, as in all other questions, introduced.

Let us first endeavour to understand what the Church is,—its value and use in the Christian dispensation;—then, having explained certain points of agreement between the two parties, Rome and England, up to a certain height, we shall branch off into the main object which we have in view—the additions, and consequently the errors, of Romanism.

There are two senses in which the word *Church* is used. The one, a building,—the other, an assembly. Its literal derivation is in relation to the former from the Greek word *Κυριακή*, which signifies no more than "*The Lord's House*." But, it may be presumed, that every one would see, that in this sense we are not about to speak of the Church at present. The other sense, that of *an assembly*, is derived from another Greek word, *Εκκλησία*,—which we trace in our English word, *ecclesiastic*; it literally signifies "*a calling forth*." It describes those persons who are, as it were, "*called forth*," made separate from the heathens and Jews, and constituted, by such calling forth, a peculiar and holy people of God. It is remarkable that we do not hear any mention of a Church

until the time of Christ. The Jews, although, in the same sense, a people "called forth" from the rest of the world, and made peculiar unto God, yet are in no case mentioned as a *Church*. They are described under the name of "a city," and by other figures, conveying privileges; as, in the Psalms, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem;" or, "The Lord loveth the gates of Sion," and the like, but never as a Church: it seems peculiarly distinctive of Christianity. It was first used by our Lord himself, upon the occasion of St. Peter's expression of his faith: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Then Jesus replied: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my CHURCH." So far, then, we have our first notion of a Church, "*a calling forth of certain people from among others.*" But this is not all. There must be superadded the idea of these people, so called forth, being joined together in some sort of society or fellowship; and this society or fellowship may be very small, or very large, according to the circumstances of the time and place under which they are called. For instance, we hear very frequently a Church described in Scripture as being in a single family, or house, as St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 5), speaking of Priscilla and Aquila, says, "Greet the Church which is in their house;" and, in the Epistle to the Colossians, "Salute the Church which is in Nymphas' house." By this is evidently meant,

those of the household or family of Priscilla, or Nymphas, who had been called forth from among the rest of the family, and had become Christians. But then, the same proportion that cities bear to houses, do Churches in cities bear to Churches in houses; and so we again find the Church described by *cities*, as the Church at Thessalonica, at Corinth, at Ephesus, and the like, *i.e.* all the people in those several cities which had become Christian. But, wherein is their society and fellowship? Some might be in one house, some in another; but, wherever they might be, there was one common principle which bound them together—that of a peculiar faith. They believed something which other men did not believe. Differing in language, in habits, in temporal circumstances, in political government, or any other point whatsoever, out of all their varieties and differences they abstracted one point of agreement, by which they were severally called forth, from their respective languages, and habits, and stations in life, and governments; and made one—and that point was their *faith in Christ*. Thus, then, we obtain another addition to our notion of a Church; a people called forth from others, and agreeing together in a bond of fellowship, which bond is *faith*.

But still we have not enough. In every society or fellowship among men, there must be for its government and maintenance in unity, certain officers or rulers, without which its fellowship would

not long be preserved. The parts which might be separated, and be at a distance from one another, either in space or time, could not long preserve a knowledge of each other, or of the truth which was their uniting principle, unless there were directing channels to superintend and diffuse that principle. Hence, therefore, in the Church, there are officers or rulers, and a regular gradation established throughout, by which, from the one head, Jesus Christ, down to the lowest member, there is diffused, by means of subsidiary governors, *i. e.* apostles, evangelists, teachers, pastors, prophets—the great principle of faith, by which the society is to be bound together.

But still we have not enough: for, in every society or fellowship, there must be a way of initiation, and also a way of continuance in the privileges obtained. It cannot be, that men in one city, or men in another city, should, by a mere expression of their own will, be called forth from their former circumstances, and joined into this fellowship. There must be something done on the part of the society, externally to themselves, some deed of indenture or enrolment, by which the members of the society shall be initiated and distinguished. But so it is in the Church. Holy baptism—the external washing by water, with the internal regeneration of the Spirit, is that deed of initiation; and the Holy Eucharist, or eating of the consecrated bread and wine, which is made to

the faithful the body and blood of Christ, is the deed of perpetual continuance: and thus we gain another feature in our definition of a Church, and then its character is complete. Altogether, then, it is "a calling forth," and junction in a holy society, distributing from one to the other, by appointed governors, the principles of its union, receiving its initiation, and continuing its privileges, by holy external rites commanded by its head.

From this definition we shall immediately understand those figurative expressions which so constantly occur in Scripture, sometimes explaining one essential feature of the Church, sometimes another, and sometimes all, collectively; as in the mystery of a husband and wife,—Christ, the husband,—the Church, the wife or spouse,*—representing unity, and yet gradation, under a head. Sometimes a body, with all its various members, directing and helping each other, representing again unity and gradation, under the one head—and this head particularly mentioned to be Christ, the Lord.† Sometimes, again, a tree, under the process of grafting; at other times, a household, a family, a building, a vine, a fold, and the like;‡ by all which figures is maintained the idea of concentration, unity, growth, gradation, government,

* 2 Cor. xi. 2; Ephes. v. 23, 24. † 1 Cor. xii. 14-27.

‡ Rom. xi. 17; Gal. vi. 10; Ephes. iii. 15; Ephes. ii. 21; John xv. 1; John x. 16.

and the enjoyment of privileges conveyed by acts of grace from the head and fountain of all righteousness.

Now from this explanation, it will very easily appear that there are many points of agreement between Rome and England in this matter—points both of theory and practice. It does not follow that we are absolutely and altogether separated in our notions of a Church, because we differ in some particulars;—quite the reverse. We shall easily trace, according to the principle already laid down, many great and fundamental points of agreement.

1. First, we agree together that there are in this Church two great divisions; the one visible or militant here in earth, the other invisible, or triumphant in heaven. Of the one, all who are alive on earth are to be considered members, both bad and good,—like the net containing both bad and good fish, or the field containing wheat and tares; but the other contains only the mystical company and fellowship of the saints, enjoying God's presence and everlasting glory. So that this being a point of agreement, we may dismiss it from our present consideration.

2. Secondly, we agree together that in this Church there is a divinely appointed mode of government—that is by bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and that no one, save those holy persons specially ordained with peculiar functions in

each gradation, can presume to take upon himself those functions. So that this also we may dismiss from our present consideration.

3. Thirdly, we agree together that this Church has the power vested in her of conveying the sacramental ordinances, both by initiation and by continuance, she being the sole channel and instrument, ordinarily speaking, by which the gifts of the Spirit can flow from the Head to the members : and that it is only through her instrumentality that membership with Christ can be obtained. So that this again we may dismiss from our present consideration.

4. Fourthly, we agree together that this Church is CATHOLIC, *i.e.* capable of being, and meant to be, dispersed over the whole world ;—that it is also capable of being, and meant to be, ONE,—not different in different ages and people, but ONE at all times and places, in doctrine and faith. So that this also we may dismiss from our present consideration.

5. Fifthly, we agree together in all the following offices of the Church : that she is the channel by which has been conveyed to mankind the Holy Scriptures ;—that she is the witness and keeper of Holy Scriptures,—publisher and proclaimer of Holy Scriptures,—interpreter of, and guide to, Holy Scriptures,—director of all forms and ceremonies, and judge in all disputes and controversies of faith. So that all these several points we may likewise dismiss from our present consideration.

If we were arguing against Dissent, these points, or most of them, would merit our close examination, and we should have much to say on each, for it is on these points that the distinctive errors of *Dissent* are visible ; but now being occupied on the distinctive errors of *Romanism*, we may pass them all by, as things upon which there is no dispute between us. They are the foundations, which may be remembered as spoken of before, of that faith which belongs and attaches to us both, as well Anglicans as Romanists.

Where then, it may be asked, *is* the point of distinction between us? Surely there is every attribute of a Church, take it in its very highest sense, contained in the points just mentioned. Power—authority—union—office—government. Yes, we should indeed think so. But Rome makes her additions even here ;—additions of the most fearful character,—additions destructive of all the moral and social properties of our nature, —additions which, emanating from the religion of peace, have, strange to say, been the most fruitful source of war, discord, and rebellion, throughout the whole world.

Now this is to be shown from the attributes which she assumes peculiar to herself, in these two points—INFALLIBILITY and SUPREMACY.

I. First, in regard to Infallibility. Our Articles make their protest against this error in two places. In the nineteenth article, it is said: “As the

Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." And in the twenty-first article again: "General Councils, when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they may be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God." Here then we observe our extreme jealousy and care in asserting that nō here can there be found, in any national Church, an *infallible* interpreter,—neither in a council, though many,—nor much less in a bishop, being one. *Interpret*, the Church may, but only according to our twentieth article, so as to decree nothing against Scripture, "or so expound one place that it be repugnant to another."

II. Secondly, in regard to Supremacy. Our Church makes her protest against this error, as follows, in the thirty-seventh article: "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction." And then this foreign jurisdiction is more fully defined thus: "The *Bishop of Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." And again, in the thirty-ninth article,

mention is made on the same point, defining the right of every national Church to govern herself, and not to have dependance on Rome. “Every *particular* or *national* Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority.” And so stringent, so watchful is our Church, at every door and opening by which the supremacy assumed by Rome might enter in among us, that in every case of the ordination of a minister, and on every induction to a benefice, what is called the Oath of Supremacy must be formally made before the bishop, declaring that “no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.”*

Thus then the Church of England makes her protest. Now, she would not make her protest,

* OATH OF SUPREMACY.—“I, A. B., do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever; and I do declare that no foreign prince, person, &c.,” as above. See also, for farther authority in this matter, the Canons of our Church (1603) Nos. 1 and 2, in regard to which Canons, our diocesan, the Bishop of London, in his printed instructions to candidates for holy orders, says, that “the spirit of them, and, as far as is practicable, the letter of them, the clergy are bound to observe.”

were there no danger. She would not speak of a Church being liable to err, if Rome had not declared that she was free from liability to err; nor would she have spoken of the foreign jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome in England, unless the bishop of Rome had at some time assumed such jurisdiction. Therefore, now let us examine what the Church of Rome declares.

1. As to Infallibility. We find her in all places, and in all doctrines, asserting this, and asserting that,—anathematizing one, and excommunicating another,—by her mere word; not appealing to Scripture, or relying on any grounds or reasons, but solely depending on her infallibility of judgment. We do not indeed find this infallibility defined in any council or creed;—it is not talked of, or discussed openly;—but the spirit of it breathes throughout her whole teaching. It is a dogma continually *inferred*,—it is assumed as a point clearly understood among them, as if no one could ever hesitate to acknowledge it; and the strangest things are said by their writers, some even of the highest and best, to enforce it among their people;—such, for instance, as the following. Cardinal Bellarmine says: “If the pope could or should so far err as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid virtuous actions, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad.”* The meaning of which must

* De Pontiff. Rom. Lib. iv. c. 5.

be, not that the Pope could ever be supposed to command the practice of vice, but only this : so *infallible* must he be, that he never could do so. Again, I find another most strange paradox in the following words from Cusanus : “ The Scripture is fitted to the time, and variously to be understood, so that at one time it is expounded according to the present fancy of the Church,—and when that fancy is changed, then the sense of Scripture may be also changed ; and when the Church doth change her judgment, God doth change His also.”* This is *indeed* infallibility—we might say, blasphemy—defying common sense, in order to maintain that the decrees of councils and popes, however differing and opposing one another, still are consistent and true ; and thus two contraries to be believed at the same time.

And this is not confined to any period very remote. Advancing to more modern times, we find this doctrine not lost sight of. Milner, in a work called “ The True Rule of Faith,” says thus : “ The whole business of Scripture belongs to the Church.” And then shortly after, he adds : “ Hence it is impossible that the real sense of Scripture should ever be against her.” Thus, arguing in a circle, the Scripture speaks of the Church, and the Church speaks of the Scripture ; but then the Church pronounces herself what the

* Card. Cusan. Extracted from Heylin, folio, p. 403.

real sense of Scripture is. It cannot, therefore, of course be stated against her.

II. But secondly as to *Supremacy*. In this we have not, as in the other, to depend on any *inferences* derived from the teaching of her Church ; but we find her speaking out most decisively in many of her councils ;—I mean, of course, those councils which have been convened subsequent to the times of her corruption. To exemplify this, let us take the fourth council of Lateran, A.D. 1215. Speaking against the Eastern Churches, who had committed some error against her jurisdiction, this council states : “ Being willing to remove so great a scandal from the Church of God,—at the advice of the sacred council, we distinctly charge them that they attempt nothing of the sort for the future, but submit themselves like obedient children to the holy Church of Rome.” And in the next canon, still more openly : “ We ordain that next after the Church of Rome, which at God’s disposal obtains the principality of ordinary power over all others, as being the mother and mistress of all Churches,—the Church of Constantinople have the first place ;” and so on, enumerating the other Churches. Again, the council of Florence, A.D. 1438, says thus : “ Also we decree that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff has a primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and is the true

Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, our Lord Jesus Christ has committed full power of feeding, *ruling, and governing the universal Church.*” And we know that this assumption was not only in words, but in reality; that from the time of these decrees the Church of Rome did assume, and does assume now, the power, wherever she can, of controlling and directing other national Churches;—that even among ourselves she sends unauthorized men, who are falsely called bishops (for real bishops they cannot be in England), who create thereby schism and dissent in the Church of Christ;—that she even to this day anathematizes and excommunicates all those who differ from her opinions, or reject her authority;—that, in fact, these very decrees are fulfilled in the daily practice of her Church, up to this hour. To instance this, let me put before you the following bull, which is published at Rome every Maundy Thursday: “We do, in the behalf of Almighty God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, excommunicate and anathematize all Hussites, Wickliffites” (and then, after enumerating other sects), “and also those who pertinaciously withdraw themselves or recede from *obedience to us and the Roman Pontiff for the time being.*”*

* BULL IN CENÂ DOMINI.—Add to the above, the 11th article

But still farther yet. This doctrine not only refers to a spiritual jurisdiction over other Churches and bishops,—it not only refers to a primacy in the see of Rome, so that she may be considered first in rank, or first in order,—but it also extends to a temporal power, a power of absolving subjects from their allegiance to kings, children from their parents, wives from their husbands. It extends to the right of unhinging and destroying all the bonds of social and moral intercourse between the different nations and families of the world, if it should ever happen that those bonds should be in opposition to the jurisdiction of the pontiff. To prove this, let us consider the following assertions, made by some of the Romish writers. Bellarmine says: “The Pope hath a supreme power of disposing the temporal things of all Christians, in

of the Creed of Pope Pius IV (A. D. 1564), a short time after the Council of Trent:—

“I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.”

Add also the following, which occurs in the profession of faith necessary to be made by a convert to the Roman Church:—

“I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ:”—and presently after, the conclusion of the oath is thus,—“I do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true catholic faith, WITHOUT WHICH NO MAN CAN BE SAVED.”—*Form of Reconciling a Convert.*

order to a spiritual good.”* Another writer says : “ The power of the Pope extends itself to the coercion of kings with temporal punishments, and depriving them of their kingdoms, when necessity requires.”† And the same again says : “ An excommunicate king may with impunity be deposed or killed by any one.”‡

And we know that these things were not mere theories. Without reference to other countries, we know, in our own history, how often our kings and queens have been formally deposed, and subjects absolved from their allegiance, as in the case of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth. Pope Pius V thus writes his sentence of excommunication against Queen Elizabeth. After some preliminary matter, asserting the right and authority for so doing, the bull concludes thus : “ We, out of the plenitude of our apostolical authority, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth a heretic and an encourager of heretics. We likewise declare the said Elizabeth deprived of the pretended right to the kingdom of England, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever ; and that all the nobility and subjects of the said realm who have sworn to her in any manner whatsoever, are for ever absolved from any such oath, and from all obligation of fidelity and allegiance.”

Such, my brethren, is a picture of the Roman

* Bellarmine de Summ. Pontiff. lib. 5, c. 6.

† Suarez. Defens. Fid. Cathol. Lib. iii. c. 23.

‡ Lib. vi. c. 6. See also Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215 ; Canon

Church,—a picture depending, not upon mere surmises or assertions, but founded, as you now see, upon historical and well-known documents and facts.

And how shall we combat all this? How shall we explain to you that all these doctrines are, according to our principle, *additions to the faith*, and therefore to be denied? We can do so most readily. Neither this infallibility nor this supremacy were ever allowed within the first four hundred years of Christ. And even many centuries more elapsed, before it was publicly or authoritatively taught.

I. First, as to Infallibility. Not only is there no mention of such a doctrine, but councils and decrees, and facts of history, exist in abundance during the course of the four first centuries of Christianity, which decidedly negative any such assumption. If there is infallibility in the Church of Rome, let us ask *where* it is,—in what person or persons it is vested? To this we can get no answer. No one in their Church knows where it

III.—“If any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to cleanse his country of heretical filth, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication by the metropolitan; and if he shall scorn to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, that thenceforth he may declare his vassals *to be absolved from their fidelity to him*, and may expose his land to be occupied by the Catholics [Romanists], who, *having exterminated the heretics, may without contradiction possess it*, and preserve it in purity of faith.”

is. They are all at variance about it. Sometimes it is in the pope himself,—sometimes in the pope in conjunction with a general council,—sometimes in the pope in conjunction with a council of cardinals,—sometimes it is neither one nor other of the above, but lies hid in some mysterious way in the Church diffusive.

Thus it is ever with them. Fix them in one position, and prove that position wrong,—they fly to another. Cardinal Bellarmine, from whom we have just quoted, says : “ All Romanists are agreed on two points.” *Wherever* the infallibility lies, at least the pope in general council is infallible. And then he goes on : “ Even out of general council, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, he is to be obeyed, whether really infallible or not.” But surely a power which is so maintained as this—so contrary to common sense, so contradictory in itself—when we know that one pope has many times decreed the very reverse of a preceding pope, or one council the very reverse of a preceding council ;—that one part of Christendom has received such and such decrees as binding, while at the same moment another part of Christendom has rejected them ;—when we know that many times in history there have been two or more rival popes assuming the papacy at the same time, and contradictory factions have for years split the whole Church in twain, each anathematizing the other ;—when we know all this, how

can we assent to a dogma so impossible to be included from such premises ?

[Let the reader observe carefully in the note below the instances of contradictions in doctrine which occur in the papal history, and then consider, if it be necessary, whether infallibility can exist in such contradictions.]*

* Honorius was Pope of Rome, but for certain peculiar opinions, the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 680, made the following decree—"We acknowledge also Honorius who was formerly Pope of Rome, to be among those cast out of the holy Church of God, and anathematized ! Accordingly his writings were ordered to be burnt, and the people exclaimed, "Anathema to the heretic Honorius !" *Council of Constantinople, 13th, 14th, and 17th Actions.* A pope, therefore, is not infallible.

Again: Pope Alexander III, A. D. 1179, condemned Peter Lombard of heresy ; thirty-six years after, Pope Innocent III absolved him, without any recantation of his opinions.

The Gallican Church receives the councils of Basle and Constance. The Roman Church rejects them.

The second council of Lateran condemns the council of Basle.

Prayers are commanded to be said in the people's own language by the fourth Lateran, but forbidden by the Council of Trent.

The council of Laodicea is against Transubstantiation, but the fourth Lateran teaches it. So also does Trent.

The celibacy of the clergy is enjoined by the first Lateran and by Trent, but Nice is against a forced celibacy.

In the 16th century there were no less than three popes at once ; John XIII at Rome, Gregory XII at Rimini, and Benedict XIII at Avignon, but the Council of Pisa deposed the two latter, the Council of Constance the former. Here indeed, is a confusion of infallibility !

II. Next let us observe on the question of *Supremacy*, what documents or proof have we in this case? Abundance, both in public councils and private writers.

For instance, the council of Nice (A.D. 315): "It is most fitting that a bishop be appointed by *all the Bishops* in his province." Constantinople, A.D. 381: "Let not the bishops go out of their diocese to Churches beyond their bounds, nor cause a confusion of Churches. Let not the bishops go out of their diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical offices; but observing the above written canon concerning dioceses, it is clear that the synod of each province will manage the affairs of the province according to the decrees of Nice." Then we have a remarkable synodal epistle from the bishops at Constantinople to the bishops of the West, which says as follows—making *Jerusalem*, not Rome, the mother of Churches: "We acknowledge the most venerable Cyril, most beloved of God, to be bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, *which is the mother of all Churches.*" Again, the same thing will appear by the council of Ephesus, A.D. 438; so also Antioch, A.D. 451; so also Chalcedon, the same date; so also as far down as the third council of Constantinople, A.D. 680.

Now if we go from councils to writers and historical facts, the same thing will appear again. In the letters of St. Cyprian to several popes of Rome, we find that he always styles them *brethren*

and *colleagues*, not superiors. Liberius, pope of Rome, writes to Athanasius, and he writes not as a bishop superior to him, but seeking his advice as an equal. "Write," he says, "whether you think as we do about the true faith, that I may undoubtedly be assured about what you think good to command me." St. Cyprian again, A.D. 230, says thus: "The rest of the Apostles were as much privileged as Peter, and were all invested with a like proportion of power and honour."* But much earlier than this, Ignatius says, early in the second century, "All should obey their bishop, and the bishop obey Christ."† There is no pope intervening between the bishop and Christ. Again, we find a remarkable fact in Irenæus (A.D. 200). He publicly reprov'd Victor, bishop of Rome, for excommunicating the Eastern Churches.‡ Again, later in the history, Jerome says (A.D. 400): "Whosoever will be a bishop, whether of Rome or elsewhere, is of the same worth, and the same priesthood."§

Add to all this the fact that all through history, whenever the superiority of the papal power was pretended, it was continually resisted, until force prevailed;—that in the Eastern Churches this spirit of resistance has continued up to this day, witness our sending forth a bishop of the Reformed Church to Jerusalem, principally because of the

* Cyprian de simpl. Prelat.

† Epist. ad Smyrn. et Philadelph.

‡ Eusebius i. 5. c. 24.

§ Hieronym. ad Evagrium.

unjust aggressions of Rome, those bishops having never yet acknowledged the pope. Add to this the undoubted testimony of Scripture, which so carefully teaches an abstinence from every sort of ambition or desire of preeminence in one Apostle above another ;—witness the case of James and John : and the equality of power given to them all, in their apostolic commission : “ Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.” Add to this moreover the continual injunctions to obey the civil power, and to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake. Add to this again the undoubted spirit of the whole Gospel, which forbids contention and war, and sets before all men, and much more the ministers of the Gospel, “ on earth peace, and good-will towards men.” Add all this together, and see whether we have not a right to say that the Church of Rome, in arrogating to herself these two powers of infallibility and supremacy, has not made unwarrantable,—nay, sinful and dangerous additions, to the faith of the Catholic Church. There is altogether a picture presented to us of the most fearful assumptions which can be conceived possible. The Church, which should have been preaching peace, promoting war and bloodshed ; the Church, which should have united all men in one friendly brotherhood, fomenting by secret stratagem, and authorizing openly by her spiritual authority, dis-

union in families, and rebellion in kingdoms. The Church, to whom were committed "the keys" for the spiritual purpose of the "ministry of reconciliation," perverting that purpose into a political engine of worldly pride and ambition, and sowing throughout the whole world the seeds of her endless despotism, stopping short at nothing, so long as her supremacy might be acknowledged.

And is it to such a Church as this, to such powers and doctrines as these, that the men of the present day are crying out in alarm that their clergy are leading them? Is it really considered and meant, that because they wish (as they are directed to say that they wish, in the Communion Service) to restore the ancient discipline of the Church in regard to sin and ungodliness among men, that therefore they desire to restore it to any such discipline as this?—that because they desire to raise the character and authority of their bishops and presbyters, paying them the high reverence due to their office, as of apostolic succession, and maintaining strictly all gradations of obedience from the one to the other,—that therefore we are striving to restore any *such* high reverence for the priesthood, or any *such* gradation of obedience, or any *such* supremacy of power, as this?

Is it really meant and considered, that because we would have all authority in controversies, and all power in commanding ceremonies vested in the

Church, her synods, and her convocation, that therefore we desire such supreme and absolute jurisdiction over the souls and consciences of men, as that of Rome? Is it really meant and considered, that when we desire the power of the keys as given to the holy apostles, and through them committed by transmission unto us, that we would, like the Church of Rome, absolve and loose sons and daughters from their parents, or wives from their husbands, or subjects from their kings? Is it really meant and considered, that when we would say that the spiritual jurisdiction of our bishops ought to be independent of the state, and that it is wrong, and against Church principles, and against the interest of the people, that the nomination and investiture of bishops should rest with mere laymen, instead of the real and Christian authority of the anointed sovereign in person; that, therefore, we are advocating that independent ecclesiastical and spiritual domination by which the popes have claimed, to rule, not only the Church, but the people,—and not only the people, but every king and queen of every people throughout all Christendom? Is all this really meant and considered?

Surely not. My brethren, you can now see clearly enough, that when we exalt and love our Church, as it is in England, we are not exalting or loving *poper*y; that when we say we would have you obey the Church—hear the Church—reve-

rence the Church—continue in the Church—and beware lest you be cast out of the Church by your own act of excommunication, in unholy, undevo- tional lives, or absence from sacraments, or denial of her rules and doctrines, or disbelief in her articles of faith,—it is not that we wish you to go over to such a Church as that which has made the gross additions to the Catholic faith now described. Oh! no, my brethren, it is not *that* Church which we would have you love and abide in; but, it is in the Church of which our Lord and Saviour first laid the beginning in his apostles and prophets, himself the corner stone;—the Church, of which we now possess as pure and apostolical a branch (considering human infirmities) as can well be found, blessed be God, throughout the regions of Christendom;—the Church, of which there is no head, or pope, or universal bishop, or any one having pre-eminence in man, but in HIM alone, who is the “*Head of the body, the Church,—who is the beginning—the first-born from the dead,—that, in all things, HE might have the pre-eminence.*”

SERMON VI.

ISAIAH xxiv. 5.

“ They have transgressed the laws—changed the ordinance.”

IN the preceding Lectures, we have merely considered those questions which involve the authority or groundwork upon which Christianity proposes the articles of her faith. Those questions were, the Holy Scriptures, and the Church ;—the Holy Scriptures as the proof, and the Church as the witness and keeper. We shall now commence the investigation of certain doctrines which are put before us as matters of belief, resting on that authority, and which are asserted to be, on that groundwork, necessary to salvation.

Let us bear in mind, however, that *it does not come before us* to consider *all* the doctrines of Christianity ; for happily, it is not in *all* doctrines that the Church of Rome dissents from the Church Catholic,—but only those in which there is some distinctive error on her part. It does not come before us, for instance, to consider the doctrine of

the Incarnation, of the Divinity of Christ, of the Holy Trinity, and many others ; for in these both Churches agree. Therefore, we put aside all such, as points beyond our present object ; and seize only on such as manifest to us unjust and unauthorized deviations from the ancient faith of Christianity.

In doing this, the first great mass of doctrine which strikes our attention, is that of THE SACRAMENTS. This subject will require, in its various branches and details (as will be seen as we proceed), several distinct lectures ; because under this head will be ranged some of the chief and most prominent errors of Romanism. Let us pray God for his holy guidance, that we may speak of these things with all fairness and candour of argument, and, specially towards our misled and mistaken brethren, with charity.

First, we must endeavour to explain *what a Sacrament is* ; and in this, up to a certain point, we shall find a considerable agreement between the two Churches. Secondly, we shall have to speak of the *number of the Sacraments*, wherein the errors of Rome begin ; and then, having so done, we shall be required to branch off into various matter in detail, both showing how their number is erroneous, and their manner of holding even such as we agree in, contrary to the Scriptures and the Church.

I. First, then, *What is our notion of a Sacrament?*

When we consider what religion is by its derivation (*religare*), “a binding of oneself to God,”—it would appear natural and probable that there should be in religion certain outward rites, by which we might bind ourselves to God ;—that is, that there should be federal acts, as of a covenant. This then, in its broadest sense, is a sacrament,—a public federal act, from the oath (*sacramentum*) of the Roman soldier, by which he bound himself to the faithful service of his general. But a sacrament in religion is more than a federal act ;—it is also a *mystery*. There is a *secret* conveyance of certain privileges and immunities to the person who places himself within the obligations of the covenant. On the part of man, there is an act of obedience in performing an outward ceremony, with conditions attached; but on the part of God there is at the same moment a mysterious communication, of some grace inwardly to the soul. So that to constitute a sacrament, there are two parts,—one, a thing done outwardly by man, which is visible; the other, a thing done inwardly by God, which is invisible. But still again, this is not enough to constitute a sacrament; for there must be in this outward action a divine institution. It must be evident that we of ourselves have no right to devise or invent a ceremonial observance, and then charge it with the conveyance of a blessing from God. How could we know, however beautiful and decorous a ceremony of human invention might be,

that it had the power of conveying an inward grace from God, unless God had so promised it? We cannot make promises for God. Therefore, to the other points just mentioned we must add a third,—that a sacrament, to be a true sacrament, must have *its institution from God*. And this you will find exemplified in two of the principal rites of the children of Israel,—in circumcision and the passover. In circumcision, an outward act, federal,—that is, a covenant performed in obedience by man,—conveying an inward grace, admission into God's Church, and to all its privileges; and the whole, both the outward act commanded, and the inward grace promised, by God himself. In the passover, just in the same way, the slaying of a lamb and sprinkling of blood, with certain ceremonies,—an outward act, charged with an inward grace, immediately operative on the due performance of the outward act,—namely, the salvation of the house from the destroying angel; and both the outward act commanded, and the inward grace promised, by God himself.

But even yet perhaps we have not quite obtained a full notion of the value and force of a sacrament. Wherein, it may be asked, lies its efficacy, as conveying a blessing, distinct from other religious duties? For instance, God has promised a blessing, and to convey his grace, by many other observances besides sacraments. He has promised his blessing to the reading of Scrip-

ture, to the hearing of sermons, to prayer, to almsgiving, and the like. Certainly. There must then be some grace *proper* to a sacrament, which, including all the rest, goes beyond them. It is this : a participation in the fellowship of Christ, a communion in his Church, a membership of his body. For let us take those points just mentioned. Reading of Scripture. There is a grace promised,—instruction, edification, enlightenment of the mind ; but it is evident that men might receive all this, to a certain extent, without union in the body of Christ, which is the Church. Even as the Ethiopian eunuch—who was reading in Scripture, and received a blessing from God ; for Philip the deacon, by God's direction, came to him, and expounded the prophet, whom before he could not understand. Nevertheless, he had need of a sacrament afterwards, and was baptized. So in prayer. It is quite true there is a grace promised,—elevation and comfort of the mind, and acceptance with God, but it is evident that men may receive this, and still need something more, as Cornelius did, whose prayers went up to God for a memorial of him ; for he received a sacrament afterwards, and was baptized. The grace *proper* to a sacrament, which neither the eunuch nor Cornelius had, although they read Scripture and prayed, was their union in the body of Christ, and their remission of sins, by being incorporated into his Church. And this also may be seen in

the case of infants ; for if there were no grace in a sacrament beyond instruction, as in reading Scriptures,—or in edification and comfort of the mind, as in prayer,—how wrong it would be to apply a sacrament to infants, which, by reason of their age, could be of no benefit whatever to them. And thus speaks Hooker : “ Unto infants which are not capable of instruction, who would not think it a mere superfluity that any sacrament be administered, if to administer a sacrament be but to teach receivers what God doeth for them ? There is of sacraments, therefore, a more excellent and heavenly use.” A *mysterious* use. An incorporation of the receiver into the mystical body of Christ, which is the company of all faithful men.

Thus then we see the force and necessity of a sacramental grace, as distinct from all other graces ; and how this fourth consideration fills up the whole of the definition, and makes it perfect. We collect from it all, that there must be, to constitute a sacrament : 1. Matter ; 2. Form ; 3. Institution ; 4. Federal Acts ; 5. Blessings conveyed ; and, 6. Union into the Body of Christ.

In all the above considerations, the Church of Rome appears to agree with ourselves. In her *definition* of a sacrament, there could appear no error at all. We, on our part, say, in the twenty-fifth article : “ Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses

and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." And in our catechism, we say: "A sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward spiritual grace, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." The Church of Rome, on her part, says in her Trent catechism thus: "There must be an outward visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, divinely instituted for our justification; that the institution must have been by Christ, as none can make a thing an instrument and vehicle of grace, but the author and giver of grace. Its parts are two,—matter and form; matter, an outward thing, subject to the senses; and form, words by which the matter is sanctified and appropriated to its sacramental use. It signifies at least three things: present grace, the passion of Christ, and life eternal. In receiving of it, federal acts pass between God and us, which on our part are the visible stipulations and profession of Christianity, and on God's part forgiveness, acceptance, and salvation." Nothing, it is evident, can be more clear, more true, and more in accordance with all that I have just been describing as the essential characteristics and definition of a sacrament. Up to this point, therefore, our agreement is safe.

II. The next consideration is *the number* of the sacraments, and herein a distinctive error of Romanism immediately arises: for, while we account the number, agreeing with the early Church as "*two only* generally necessary to salvation," they add to this number, and make them *seven*. And here let us observe, as necessary to illustrate this point, and to show some apparent reason for this remarkable difference,—let us observe, that the word Sacrament is used by the ancient fathers in two different senses—the one, a lower and more vague sense, comprehending almost every holy rite of Christianity; the other, a higher and more strict sense according to our definitions before given. Thus, for instance, St. Cyprian speaks of a sacrament in "the Lord's Prayer;" St. Bernard, calls "washing the disciples' feet" a sacrament; others call the "tree of life" a sacrament;* and

* There is nothing more usual with the ancients than this way of speaking;—to call *every sacred rite and ceremony* used in the Church by the name of a sacrament or mystery. As St. Austin calls exorcism a sacrament. And the salt that was given to the catechumens before baptism, is called the sacrament of the catechumens, both by St. Austin and the third council of Carthage, as has been observed in another place. It is usual also with the ancients to divide the proper sacraments, baptism and the eucharist, each of them into two or more, meaning the several parts or rites belonging to them. Thus, Isidore speaks of four sacraments in the Church,—which are, baptism, chrism, the body of Christ, and the blood of Christ. As, therefore, the bread and wine are called two sacraments, though they be but parts of

even one of our own homilies speaks of matrimony as a sacrament :—"By like holy promises, the sacrament of matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love."* And this loose, or lower sense of speaking of sacraments, runs through many of our own writers. Bishop Taylor says : "It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two sacraments only, but that of those rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments (by a word of art), two only are generally necessary to salvation."† In the same way, Hooker :—"As oft as we mention a sacrament properly understood (for, in the

the same eucharist, so the washing and the unction are called two sacraments, though they be but two rites of the same sacrament of baptism.—*Bingham*, book xii. chap. ii. sect. iv. (The reader must remember that anointing, *i.e.* chrism, always formed, in the ancient Church, a part of baptism, as well as washing by water.)

In a similar manner, Bishop Jewel describes this sense of the sacraments, as contained in the Fathers. St. Bernard calleth the washing of the apostles' feet a sacrament. "The washing of feet in the sacrament of daily sins." So Leo calleth the cross of Christ a sacrament. "The cross of Christ, which was given to save the faithful, is both a sacrament and also an example." Tertullian calleth the whole state of Christian faith, "the sacrament of the Christian religion." St. Hilary saith, in divers places, "the sacrament of prayer," "the sacrament of fasting," "the sacrament of thirst," "the sacrament of weeping," "the sacrament of the Scripture."—*Jewel, Treatise on the Sacraments.*

* Homily on Swearing.

† Jeremy Taylor, Works, vol. x. p. 438.

writings of the ancient fathers, all articles which are peculiar to the Christian faith,—all duties of religion containing that which sense or natural reason cannot of itself discern, are most commonly named sacraments), our restraint of the word is to some few principal divine ceremonies.”* So, also, Thorndike :—“ In fine, the name and notion of a sacrament, as it hath been duly used by the Church, and writers allowed by the Church, extendeth to all holy actions, done by virtue of the office which God hath trusted his Church with, in hope of obtaining the grace which he promiseth.”† Not to mention other writers, we shall find precisely the same language held in our Book of Homilies. In the homily entitled, “ Of the Common Prayer and Sacraments,” it is thus said :—“ In a general acceptation, the name of a sacrament may be attributed to any thing, whereby an holy thing is signified ; in which understanding of the word our ancient writers have given this name not only to the other five commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like, but not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments in the *same signification that the two forenamed sacraments are.*”‡

* Hooker, Eccl. Polity, book v.

† Thorndike, Epilogue, book iii. p. 349.

‡ Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, folio, p. 224.

So that we shall understand from all this, that when we speak of the number of sacraments, we must be watchful that we are speaking of them in the same sense. If we speak of them in the lower sense, then the number is quite indefinite, inasmuch as holy rites and ceremonies in religion must be in a certain way indefinite; but, if we speak of them in the higher sense, in that strict sense of the definition which we have already laid down, then we are prepared to show that the number must be confined to "*two only*."

Upon a little examination we shall find that our twenty-fifth article is exactly framed to meet these two senses of the word sacrament, and so also is the definition given in the Catechism. The twenty-fifth article first defines a sacrament to be as before observed, "ordained of Christ, not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him." And then it goes to limit the number by this definition to two, excluding those "*now commonly called sacraments*." And of these so commonly called, it then goes on to affirm, that they are not sacraments in the high and strict sense, as necessary to salvation. "They have not," says the article, "*the like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's Supper*, for

that they have not any visible sign or ceremony *ordained of God.*"*

So far then our own Church. Let us now see what the Church of Rome says. In the council of Trent (A.D. 1547), we find the following canon :

"If any shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that they are more or fewer than seven, to wit,—baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, repentance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament—let him be accursed." Now, observe in this how perversely accurate these words are,—so, that do all we can for charity's sake, we cannot agree with her—for she limits the number both ways to seven, and says they are no more, nor fewer. If we could take the lower and more vague sense of a sacrament (as explained), we might perhaps agree in that sense, that sacraments were more than two; but then we should also be compelled to say they were more than seven. If again we take it in the higher and more limited sense, then we must exclude not only the many other rites which the fathers

* It is very remarkable, that in our Articles drawn up in the reign of Edward the Sixth, the number *two* is not mentioned at all. The Article, in king Edward's reign, was thus :

"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people, with sacraments *most few in number*, most easy to be kept," &c.—*Articles*, published A.D. 1553.

mention, as of a sacramental character; but we must also exclude those very five which the council of Trent insists upon. Whichever sense then of a sacrament we take, we cannot agree in that canon; for, in the lower sense, there must be more than seven,—while, in the higher sense, there must be less.

But how does this assertion agree with the definition which they themselves give? They have defined it to be, “*a visible form of invisible grace ordained of Christ.*” Now how they can make confirmation, for instance, a sacrament *ordained of Christ*, we must leave to them to explain, for it passes our comprehension of what is possible.

However, passing this by for a moment, let me show you that this fanciful number of seven is a mere novelty, never heard of in the pure ages of Christianity. In the first centuries, there is nothing said, in any writer whatever, on this subject. This, in itself, is a testimony against Rome; for, if it had been a vital doctrine, it surely would have been mentioned, either in Scripture, or in the fathers. But, going on beyond the first ages, we find St. Ambrose (A.D. 374) writing especially on the subject of the sacraments;—he mentions, however, all through his book, *two only*. St. Augustine (A.D. 395) says expressly: “These be the two sacraments of the Church;” and afterwards he mentions them—“the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of our Lord.”

Even so low down as the beginning of the seventh century, we find a similar testimony. Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, speaks thus :—" The sacraments are—baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of Christ ; which are called sacraments," because, under the external of bodily things, the divine virtue works the grace of the sacraments. It may be necessary to observe, that the baptism and chrism here mentioned are one ; it being customary, in those days, to anoint, as well as to wash, in that holy service (see note at p. 131). Thus, it appears, that up to the seventh century, the doctrine of the seven sacraments was unheard of ; in fact, Peter Lombard, in the twelfth century, is the first writer who gives this number. In the fifteenth century, Eugenius IV, pope of Rome, decreed that the number was seven ; and then in the next century, comes the Council of Trent, which declares it, under anathema, to be an article of faith. Our conclusion, therefore, upon the whole is plain—our satisfaction complete—that the number of Gospel sacraments, or sacraments necessary to salvation, are, according to our article, *two only*, and that the addition of five others by Rome, under anathema, is an unauthorised novelty, an addition not recognised by the Catholic Church.

III. Having thus defined what a sacrament is, and shown you the distinctive error of Romanism in making the number *seven*, our next business is to clear away those five which Rome has added,

and to prove to you that they are wrongly called sacraments, in a Gospel sense. The two in which we agree are, of course, well known:—Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. In Baptism, there is no material difference in point of doctrine; in the Lord's Supper, there are very material and serious differences. These we shall have to treat of separately,—therefore, for the present, we may put these also aside. And now the five which remain so called by Rome, are—confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction.

1. First then, we have to show that *Confirmation* is not a sacrament. Certainly it is a holy rite, highly advantageous, full of beauty, abounding in spiritual meaning, and, being of apostolic ordinance, necessary to be observed by all men, where it may be had; but if we compare it with the definition, it cannot be called a sacrament necessary to salvation. It is true that the Church of Rome has made for it matter and form (which, you remember, were agreed upon as necessary to make a sacrament). She has made for it—*matter*, in appointing oil to be used in that ceremony; and she has appointed *a form*, in using the words: “I confirm thee with the oil of salvation.” But where do we find that the Apostles used either this oil or these words? Much more,—where do we find that our Lord Jesus Christ used them? He never alludes to such a ceremony in any way whatever. Now it is evident that the Romanists

will grant this, but turn upon us with a declaration that *tradition*, as coming from the apostles, sanctions it as being a command of Christ. But we have already determined, that though tradition *may* point out to us useful and spiritual ceremonies, yet we cannot allow that tradition is to attribute words and commands to Christ, and that upon such supposed words or commands a sacrament is to be founded, as essential to salvation. We have already determined, that if there had been such words or commands, they would have been found in Scripture. (See Sermons III and IV.) Not being found in Scripture, we reject them, and cannot therefore believe that confirmation was an institution of Christ. But the Council of Trent declares that the sacraments of the new law *are all instituted by our Lord Christ*, and in her definition she says, that the institution as a sacrament *must have been by Christ*. How then can this be? She contradicts Scripture, and therefore we may leave her, for that cannot be a sacrament of the Gospel which was not instituted till after the death of Christ.

II. The next sacrament on the Romish list is *Penance*, generally called the “sacrament of repentance,” or “absolution;” but of this we shall not speak at present, as it will require a separate consideration, involving under it many Romish doctrines and practices of great consequence in this discussion. Under penance considered as a

sacrament, we shall have to review the doctrines of contrition, confession, absolution, and satisfaction; and then under satisfaction we shall have again to consider indulgences, purgatory, and prayers for the dead. All these doctrines being of much importance, it is evidently better to put aside the sacrament of penance at present, and return to it in a subsequent lecture, taking all other points in order, which seem to follow from it.

III. The next on the Romish list is *Holy Orders*. Here, just as in confirmation, we agree to a certain point, but not altogether. Some parts of the definition of a sacrament orders does fulfil, but not the whole. But as it does not fulfil the whole, it must of necessity be rejected. That holy orders is a means of grace, we readily allow; that it is a federal act, we readily allow, the person ordained entering into a most solemn and holy compact with God, none more solemn; that it was appointed as a means of continuing among men the apostolic succession, and so conveying to them throughout all time the offices and graces of the ministry—all this we readily allow; but remembering our definition, we shall require more for a sacrament necessary to salvation, than even all these points; we shall require matter and form, not only the *thing* instituted by Christ, but the *matter* and *form* *instituted by him*. Such was the case in holy baptism; such was the case in the holy eucharist; but in holy orders it is evidently not so. We do

not find any especial form commanded by Christ. It is said in St. Matthew, "when he called unto him his twelve disciples, *he gave them power.*" In St. Mark: "*He ordained twelve.*" In St. Luke: "Of them *he chose twelve;*" and again: "He *sent them* to preach." But it was not said that there was any particular matter used, such as oil or water, or any particular words. The only thing approaching any resemblance to a sign is in St. John xx. 22: "He *breathed* on them, and said: Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Here it would be possible to say the *breathing* was an outward sign, and "*Receive ye the Holy Ghost,*" the form; but we must bear in mind that this was done long after their ordination. The apostles had been appointed and sent forth to their holy work, two, if not three years before these words were used; so that they cannot have anything to do with the actual ordination of ministers; and I do not believe that the Romanists themselves affirm that they have. There is a sign indeed now used by both Churches—the laying on of hands—but this laying on of hands is only of apostolic authority, not our Lord's; and there is a form of prayer, but it is only the *Church's* form, and does not pretend to any institution of Christ. Therefore, in all these points, ordination fails as a sacrament. But they make another attempt even yet. In the twelfth century, a form was introduced of delivering the holy vessels to the priest, with these words of

power, to “offer sacrifices to God, and to celebrate masses,” and the delivery of the vessels was made to look like *matter*, and the words like *form*. But still again, however decorous it may be, and however significant, to deliver the holy vessels to the priest, as demonstrating his authority as a steward of the mysteries of God, still this does not bring it within the definition of a sacrament. There is no institution of such things by Christ. Things may be invented and commanded by a Church, which, however they may constitute a ceremony, cannot constitute a sacrament. Therefore, upon the whole, on these grounds, highly reverencing and maintaining the service of ordination, esteeming it vitally necessary for a right transmission of the apostolic commission throughout all ages, and considering that in a very high degree grace is conferred in that holy rite, still it cannot be called a gospel sacrament, or be, in the same sense as baptism and the Lord’s supper, essential to salvation.*

iv. The next on the Romish list is *Matrimony*. How this could ever be introduced as a sacrament of Christianity, it is quite impossible to conceive ;

* Something similar to this will be found in our own ordination services. To a deacon, the New Testament is delivered ; to a priest and to a bishop, the Bible ;—with suitable words to each order, as demonstrating that out of those Scriptures their authority and commission is to preach God’s word. See the *Services for Holy Orders*.

for all men know that it was a law, not only of the Jewish dispensation, but even long before the Jewish dispensation, given by God at the creation to Adam and Eve. It is true that marriage was confirmed and recognized by our Lord, and set upon a higher and purer footing than the Jews had considered it, but certainly it cannot be said to be *instituted* by Christ, or to bear any particular mark or designation of Christianity. And thus Bishop Stillingfleet says: "A holy rite or state of life, having its institution in paradise. One would wonder how it came into men's heads to call it a sacrament of the new law, instituted by Christ.*

But the Council of Trent asserts: "If any shall say that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the Gospel, ordained by Christ himself, but that it is a human invention in the Church, and does not confer grace, let him be accursed." We must observe the sophistry here of joining two things together which have nothing to do the one with the other. That it is

* In the Romish catechisms, we find it thus stated:

"Q. When was matrimony made a sacrament of the New Law?

"A. It is uncertain. (!) Some think it was at the wedding in Cana of Galilee; others, more probably, say it was done when Christ declared the indissolubility of marriage.

"Q. What is the *matter* in this sacrament?

"A. The mutual consent of the parties, and the giving themselves one to another." (!)—*Doyle's Abridgment of Christian Doctrine.*

a human invention in the Church, who would ever assert that had read his Bible? That it is of a high, spiritual character, of divine institution, a blessing to man, and confers a grace upon those who enter upon such a holy state with a right mind, who can deny, that has read the epistles of St. Paul? He elevates it so highly as to make it a representation of Christ and his Church, and so to call it a mystery. No one who knows the Scriptures would for a moment dispute any of these positions; but why should we be called upon, in the very same sentence, to say that it *is ordained of Christ*, when it so manifestly was not? It falls, therefore, as a sacrament of the Gospel; and, although, in the lower sense, even as it is found in our own homilies, it may be sacramental, yet it is not one of those sacraments that are “necessary to salvation.” And see how inconsistent is the Church of Rome,—how she contradicts herself. In the one place she makes matrimony a sacrament, and yet in another she forbids a very great portion of her people from entering into it. Nay, not only so, but she holds out to the people great inducements to avoid it, praising, as we know she does, virginity and celibacy in a most unscriptural way, inventing societies of monasteries for men, and nunneries for women, where, from their very institutions, this so-called sacrament is forbidden. Hear the Council of Trent. In the first canon she asserts it to be one

of the seven sacraments. In the tenth canon she asserts: "If any shall say that the conjugal state is to be preferred to that of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be joined in matrimony, let him be accursed." Thus we see in one case, very high and exalted rewards of spirituality and elevation above the world attributed to those who forsake matrimony, whereby they exalt something of their own above a sacrament; but in the other case, by exalting matrimony to such a high spiritual ordinance as to call it a sacrament, they surely must mean to place it beyond any ordinance or rule of life, merely of human institution. The two things cannot agree together.

v. We now come to the last of the so-called sacraments of Rome: *Extreme Unction*. Of this we take no notice whatever in our Church. In all the others we do agree so far as to esteem them holy rites and ceremonies, and to provide for them forms of service; but in extreme unction we do not even agree so much as to recognize it in any way. It will then be necessary to explain what extreme unction is. The matter used in this Romish ceremony is oil—*oil of olives blessed by the bishop*—and the form of it is the applying this oil to the five senses, with these words pronounced: "By this unction of holy oil, and his affectionate mercy, may God

forgive thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight and the other senses.”* By this is meant that the grace of God visits the person so anointed sacramentally, that the five senses are cleansed from all defilements of sin, and the soul is rendered fit for the kingdom of heaven. The authority from which this ceremony is derived is certainly not our Lord’s. Were we, as before, to take their own definition, that a sacrament must be of divine institution, even on this ground we shall be compelled to deny it altogether. But let us waive this, and consider the texts upon which they support it. These texts are Mark vi. 13: “They anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them;” and the passage from St. James v. 14: “Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick.” Now it is well-known that the texts in question refer to the miraculous bodily cures of the sick, which, in apostolic times, were performed by the power of the Holy Ghost, and can in no sense be referred to the ordinary cases of the sick at the present time, when miraculous power is no longer among us. It is also evident that the texts in question refer to cases where the anointing, accompanied by prayer, is supposed to effect a *cure* from sick-

* Ordo Administr. Sacrament. *London*, 1831, p. 81.

ness;* for in the former it is said : “ They anointed many that were sick, and *healed them*”; and in the latter it is said : “ The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall *raise them up* ;” whereas the pretended sacrament of extreme unction, as the words import, is applied only to those cases where death is immediately impending, and recovery thought to be hopeless. Again, a sacrament, by virtue of its definition, does not pretend to contemplate any *bodily* benefit, but only spiritual; and there is no instance on record in the ancient Church, where anointing the sick was practised, but in cases where there was a *bodily* cure intended, and the forms of prayer directed to be used in the ancient rituals always bear reference to this. Thus, for instance, the prayer in the Greek Church at this ceremony still bears reference to the body, and not the soul : “ O holy Father, the physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to heal all diseases, and to deliver us from death, heal this thy servant from the bodily infirmity under which he now labours, and raise him up by the grace of Christ.”† So that in all points, neither the texts of Scripture, nor ancient custom,

* Cardinal Cajetan himself confesses this. Writing on this passage, he says : “ This place does not refer to the sacrament of extreme unction, because in St. James the immediate design and effect is *the cure of the person* ; but in a sacrament, the direct and proper effect is the remission of sins.”

† King’s Greek Church, *London*, 1772, p. 321.

nor the reason of the thing itself, as considered in reference to a sacrament, will countenance this addition to the faith. It fails on all sides. The real truth is, the apostolic custom, which we confess did exist for many years, of anointing and miraculously curing the sick in the body, has been retained in the Romish Church to this day, although the miraculous power has ceased ; but it has been so retained in a totally perverted and unauthorized use, and the cure which originally affected the body, is now pretended to affect the soul.

Upon the whole, then, although we might possibly allow such a ceremony as a holy rite in the visitation of the sick, yet we certainly cannot allow it for a sacrament ; although we might not pronounce it anti-Scriptural, if it were only retained as an office with prayer for God's Holy Spirit to restore the sick to health of *body*, we cannot allow it to be in the least either founded upon Scripture, or recognized by primitive practice, or apostolic tradition, when applied as it now is, to the forgiveness of the sins of the soul ; yet, nevertheless, let us hear the council of Trent. It pronounces these two canons, by which, as by many others, for this opinion we are anathematized, and cast out of her communion. " If any man say that extreme unction is not truly or properly a sacrament instituted by our Lord Christ, and declared by the apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, a human in-

vention, let him be accursed.” Again: “If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick, but that it has ceased, as if it were formerly only the grace of healing—[all of which things we have just been saying]—let him be accursed.”

And now, my brethren, we have completed our examination of the seven sacraments of Rome, leaving two of them, that of penance and the holy eucharist, for future consideration;—the one which we allow to be a sacrament, but in which many false doctrines have been introduced; and the other which we do not allow to be a sacrament, and in which also many perversions of the truth occur, which require separate discussion, *i. e.* penance. Leaving these two for future consideration, suffer me now to conclude this lecture with reminding you of one great vital principle in the Church of Rome, affecting all the sacraments equally, which is of so fearful a character,—a principle in itself, and in its effects, so dreadful,—that even if every other particle of error on the part of Rome were swept away,—if every other shade of difference were cleared up,—if every other of their anathemas were withdrawn, and they would say, “We will cancel and obliterate all our differences, if you only will agree to this,”—I repeat, that if such a thing could be possible, still this one principle affecting the sacraments, which I am now about to mention, would be so dreadful, so vitally

prejudicial to all the comforts of God's holy word, and so destructive of all the privileges of God's holy Church, that I would, for one,—and I think every one of you, my brethren, would also,—flee from the communion of such a Church, with a fearfulness and wretchedness not to be expressed. The principle I speak of is this : that there must be, in order to the full efficiency of a sacrament to the receiver, a *right intention* in the priest who administers it ;—that is to say, the graces of a sacrament cannot be imparted from God, unless the priest who administers the sacrament *intends* it at the moment of administration. You would not probably believe that there *could* be a canon of that Church so asserting ; yet you find it (Council of Trent, Session VII. canon XI.): “If any shall say that there is not required in the ministers while they perform and confer the sacraments, at least the *intention of doing what the Church does*, let him be accursed.”

Now observe what follows. In the first place, holy orders is by them a sacrament. If, therefore, any bishop in any of the past centuries, if only one in the line of succession from the Apostles, should have been secretly an infidel, or despiser of God, or, at the time of conferring orders, possessing a mind destitute of an intention to confer the grace of orders, or if he malignantly withheld the wish in the case of any individual, and so had not the “*intention of doing what the Church does*,”

—then all those clergy from him succeeding in the apostolic commission are not priests or ministers of God, because the grace of orders could not have been properly bestowed ;—then all the other sacraments performed by those ministers themselves are vitiated (because it is necessary that a sacrament should be administered by those truly ordained) ;—then those who have in countless multitudes been for ages thinking that they have been receiving God's grace in sacramental ordinances, have done no such thing. It is all forfeited,—it is all lost ; and the whole tenor of the Church a mere mockery.

But take it in not quite so extreme a case as this. Take it in any of the ordinary sacraments which apply, or might apply, to yourselves as the laity, in a direct manner, supposing yourselves for the moment to be Romanists. Marriage is by them a sacrament. If the priest performing the sacrament of marriage did not look upon it in the light the Church does, or if he had an ill-will towards you, or if he withheld his mind from the sacramental grace to be conferred, that marriage could not be a marriage ;—you would be living in adultery. Confirmation is by them a sacrament. If the bishop, at the time of laying on of hands, did not intend to confer grace upon you, you would not be confirmed. The holy Eucharist is a sacrament. If the priest, at the time of breaking and consecrating the bread, did not intend as the

Church intended, it would not be to you the consecrated bread, and your receiving it as a sacrament would be useless. Baptism is a sacrament. But if in the consecration of the water, or in using the form, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the minister should not intend the grace,—the grace would not be given, and you would not be a Christian. And, what is worse than all, the intention in all this being known only to the priest (for of course it could only be in his own mind), the intention or want of intention being known only to the priest, you could not yourselves know whether you were really married or not, were really confirmed or not, did really receive the holy Eucharist or not, or were actually Christians or not.*

* This wicked doctrine is carried still farther,—so far, that its wickedness is almost lost in its absurdity,—by their saying that if the bread and wine in the holy eucharist be not properly made, the virtue of the sacrament is lost. As for instance, in the general rubrics it is thus said:

"If the bread be not wheaten, or be mixed with grains of another kind in such quantity that it does not continue wheaten bread, or if it be at all corrupted, *the Sacrament is not made*. If it be mixed with rose water, or any other distilled water, *it is doubtful whether the Sacrament be good*. If the wine be sour, or be made from bitter or unripe grapes, or so much water be mixed with it that it becomes corrupt, *the Sacrament is not made*."—*Rubricæ Generales, Lugd.* 1827. So that by this, not only is the virtue of the sacrament at the mercy of every priest's secret mental intention, but even at the mercy of those who supply the holy elements.

And yet all this you must believe, as the consequence of this doctrine;—all this you would be bound to acknowledge as the possible result of an absence of the priest's right intention in the holy sacraments, *if you were a ROMANIST.*

SERMON VII.

2 CORINTHIANS vii. 10.

“ Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation.”

WHEN we enumerated in the preceding lecture the seven sacraments of Rome, we put aside those five, falsely so called : Orders, Confirmation, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, and Penance ; but we reserved the latter for more specific consideration, as a subject requiring longer time than we could then bestow upon it—a subject not only important in itself, but being the fountain from which many of the grossest errors of Romanism take their origin.

The words penance and repentance, in the language of Rome, seem to be very nearly akin to one another. For this so-called sacrament is described in their public councils equally under the two titles : “ Sacrament of Penance,” or “ Sacrament of Repentance.” We find it in the Council of Trent thus described : “ If all who are regenerated had such gratitude to God, as constantly to

maintain that justification, which by His gift and grace they received in baptism, there would have been no need for another sacrament to have been instituted by Him for the remission of sins. But since God, who is rich in mercy, knew whereof we are made, He hath provided a remedy of life even for them who should have afterwards delivered themselves into the slavery of sin, and into the power of the devil, namely:—" Now we should have thought the sentence would have concluded with words to this effect: "*the sacrament of the holy eucharist*;" but no, it goes on thus: "*the sacrament of repentance*." And again it is said: "If any one saith that repentance is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, for reconciling the faithful to God as often as they fall into sins after baptism, let him be accursed."* And the catechism of Trent, in the same way: "After the baptismal innocence is lost, unless one takes refuge in repentance, without doubt his salvation must be despaired of."† Thus then, in the theology of Rome—penance or repentance—is the sacrament by which, in all sins after baptism, the sinner is to be restored to a state of grace.

Now we perfectly agree in the *principle*, that repentance is necessary for the remission of sins. We know the holy Scriptures well enough to be perfectly aware that the great doctrine of the

* Concil. Trident. Sess. xiv. chap. i.

† Cat. Conc. Trident. pars ii.

Gospel is this: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"—that not only previous to baptism, but also subsequently, if we fall away from the grace once given, our duty as Christians is not to despair, but to return unto God with penitent and contrite hearts, knowing that our sins, though they be red as scarlet, yet shall be through Christ as white as snow. But how this principle—this feeling of the heart and mind, this working of the spirit unto God, with sorrow, grief, or anguish, or whatever other word we may find to describe it, being still only a mental operation, causing the sinner to reflect and to amend his ways—can be called a sacrament, surpasses our understanding. For let us consider what a sacrament is, according to the definition. A sacrament must contain a visible sign of an invisible grace, and be of divine institution. A sacrament must contain matter and form. But where is all this in *repentance*? It evidently, therefore, falls to the ground as a true gospel sacrament.

But the Church of Rome is not so unwise as to assert repentance to be a sacrament, and leave it there without any attempt to bring it within the limits of their definition. If it be a sacrament, some sort of outward sign or *matter* it must have, and some *form* it must have, and of Christ's institution it must somehow or other be made. Therefore the council of Trent finds out all this with her usual facility, and says thus: "The Lord

then chiefly instituted the sacrament of repentance, when, after being raised from the dead, He breathed on his disciples, saying: ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.’”* So much for the institution. Then for the form—it is thus: “Moreover the holy synod teacheth that the *form* of the sacrament of repentance, in which its chief force consists, is contained in the words of the minister: “*I absolve thee,*” &c.† And then again: “By way of the *matter* of the sacrament, these are the acts of the penitent himself, such as contrition, confession, and satisfaction.”‡ Here then we have at least an appearance of all that is desired—divine institution, form, and matter. But it will directly be seen how far we have travelled out of that strict notion of repentance as an operation and feeling of the mind, which in our own Church and in Scripture we generally understand by it. We have not only now before us that which Scripture means by repentance, that is, a change of mind with sorrow, terminating in action,‡ but we have also these

* Conc. Trident. Sess. xiv. chap. iii. † Id. ‡ Id.

§ It is curious to see the perverse way in which Scripture is translated by the Romanist, in order to favour his preconceived views. The Greek word for “Repent ye” is μετανοείτε, which signifies a change of *mind*,—a turning of the *mind* away from one thing to another. But this is always made, in their translation, “*pœnitentiam agite,*”—“*do penance,*” whereby they shift

three additional doctrines introduced, forced into it as it were, as a matter of Church discipline, namely, confession, absolution, and satisfaction. All our original notion of evangelical repentance, therefore, is done away. It is presented to us in an entirely new aspect. There is a mixture of truth and error in the whole thing which we find it difficult to analyze, yet we know cannot be right. It certainly is true that our Lord did pronounce the words, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted," but he pronounced many other words, and surely all the words he pronounced in this solemn way do not form sacraments. It is true that He desires, in repentance, not only sorrow, but confession of our sins; and not only confession, but also "*fruits meet for repentance*" in holy works, such as alms-giving, and prayer, and fasting; but these works, which they call satisfactions, cannot form the *matter* of a sacrament. All these doctrines which are taken up by the Church of Rome are founded upon truth, and we all agree to a considerable extent in them when taken separately. There is no error when we consider them in their spirit one by one. The error lies, just as in all else, in adding to them—in unjustly and unlawfully extending their purport and use, in classing them in this unauthorized way alto-

the meaning so as to favour their views of *doing* or making satisfactions to God in their sacrament of penance. The proper Latin translation would be, "resipiscite."

gether, and making a sacrament out of them, contrary to God's word, and to the doctrines and teaching of the universal Church.*

Having thus been satisfied, that neither in repentance as an emotion of the mind, nor in penance as an action of the life, is there any true "sacrament of the Gospel," let us now turn our attention to the very peculiar and important doctrines which the Church of Rome embraces under it, as found in the council of Trent. First, contrition; secondly, confession of sins; thirdly, absolution; and fourthly, satisfactions. The two former of these will be sufficient for our present lecture.

1. And first, *Contrition*. The great moving principle in the penitent, the first thought which is to lead him to the subsequent acts, must of course be sorrow for the past, and upon this the two Churches agree together in the main, and we could subscribe cheerfully to what is asserted by them as their doctrine on this head. "Contrition," they say, "which occupies the first place among the

* "This is our doctrine concerning repentance, in which we find no characters of a sacrament, no more than there is in prayer or devotion. Here is no matter, no application of matter by any particular form, no institution, and no peculiar federal acts. The scene here is *the mind*, the acts are internal, the effect is such also, and therefore we do not reckon it a sacrament, not finding in it any of the characters of a sacrament."—*Bishop Burnet*.

said acts of the penitent, is a grief of mind, and detestation for past sin, with an intention of not sinning for the future.”...“ Not only cessation from sin, and the intention and commencement of a new life, but also a hatred of the old one, according to that saying: Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit. And certainly any one who shall consider the cries of saints: “Against thee only have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight”—“ I am weary of my groaning; every night wash I my bed with tears”—“ I will recall before thee all my years in the bitterness of my soul ;”—and others of the same kind, will easily understand that they flowed from a vehement hatred of the past life, and a great detestation of sins.”* All this is sound, true, and evangelical, and to every word we could add our testimony that it is according to the word of God. But then, with their usual scholastic niceties, they go on from this sound foundation to build up a wild and imaginary theory. They go on to say that there may be an “*imperfect contrition*,” and to this they give the name of “*attrition*.” Now this attrition may be defined a desire to forsake a sin, not out of hatred of the sin itself, but out of fear of punishment. Even as in human things, a criminal may be deterred from the commission of crimes in

* Conc. Trident. Sess. xiv. chap. iv:

which he has once indulged, by a dread of the consequences which he knows will follow. He may forsake his criminal course of action, but nevertheless have the same liking and propensity towards it as before. The same *effect* will be produced as though he really hated what he had done, but the effect will not spring from the same cause. And this is called *attrition*. Whatever it may be, however ambiguously and plausibly they may explain it, yet still it is, by their own confession, something short of the full sense of contrition above explained. Yet they say that this attrition, *i. e.*, not a full, evangelical hatred of sin, and change of mind—not a full and perfect forsaking of the past out of remorse or sorrow, but maybe out of fear, or policy, or worldly wisdom,—this attrition, they say, if followed up by the other parts of the sacrament of penance, shall avail unto salvation. The words of the council stand thus: “The holy synod declares that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, since it is commonly conceived either from a consideration of the vileness of sin, or the *fear of hell and punishment*, if it exclude sinful will, and has hope of pardon, not only does not make a man a hypocrite, and increase his sin, but is indeed the gift of God and the impulse of the Holy Ghost; not indeed as yet indwelling, but only moving, whereby the penitent is assisted to prepare for himself a way of righteousness. And although it be unable of *itself* to bring the sinner

to justification *without the sacrament of repentance*, yet does it dispose him to obtain the grace of God in that sacrament."

Now, I need hardly point out to you, how fearful an error this is. It is evidently devised to place power in the hands of the priesthood; for, observe what is said: contrition, that is, a full change of mind, *may* avail unto forgiveness, without the remaining part of the sacrament. This the council declares "may sometimes happen;" but attrition shall equally avail, with the subsequent links of confession, absolution, and satisfaction. But these links depending on the priesthood, you cannot but observe that the tendency of the doctrine is to teach that something short of the full penitential spirit of the Gospel, may, with the aid of the priesthood, prevail with God; thereby undermining the announcements of the Gospel, diminishing the responsibility of man, and laying open the door for many of the worst sins of human nature, to the deception and peril of the soul's salvation.

II. But let us now go on to the next step in this process of repentance, and that is *Confession*. And here, as we all know, there arises a very broad distinction indeed between the two Churches. The difference between contrition and attrition may perhaps be of a scholastic, subtle character, and not generally observed; but all men know the miserable errors, depravities, tyranny, and unjust assumption of power, which the doctrine of con-

fession has introduced into the Church of Rome. And yet with all this, we agree together in the fundamental principles upon which it is made a doctrine. It is not that we deny that there ought to be in the religion of a Christian any confession of sins ; on the contrary, our doctrine is that it is a highly necessary and important duty. We use it and we practise it in our Church. The difference does not arise in the fact, but (as in all other things) in the *additions* with which the Church of Rome has encumbered it.

In this branch of the subject I shall endeavour to show you, first, what the opinions and practices of our own Church are in regard to confession of sins, and how they are all sound and in agreement with the Church universal, and then I shall point out those distinctive errors which Rome has introduced.

The doctrine of confession of sins must be considered in two ways : in regard to God, and in regard to man. That the sinner, being once contrite, having his heart and mind burdened by the grievousness of his iniquity, should seek to alleviate this burden by opening his heart, and telling out the secrets of his misery to God, is both natural and scriptural. There is an intuitive instinct within us, to think that a disclosure of any wrong is in some sort an atonement for that wrong. Thus, in all human injuries done by one man towards another, we know that what is generally called an

apology, *i. e.*, a confession of error, is universally looked upon as a ground of reconciliation; and it certainly is (as we must all have felt in our own hearts) the sure way of appeasing or pacifying the wrath of the injured person. And certainly, as it is natural, so is it scriptural. Look at the case of David, in which he says (Ps. xxxii. 5): "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will *confess* my transgressions unto the Lord." Look at the case of Ezra, in which he bids the Jewish people (Ezra x. 10) thus: "Ye have transgressed; now therefore make *confession* unto the Lord God of your fathers." In Nehemiah the same (Nehemiah i. 5), in Daniel the same (Daniel ix. 4); in short, all through Scripture, the duty of the confession of our sins to God, both privately in our closets, and publicly in the congregation of God's house, is clearly set forth as a religious duty, and no man that I know of ever denied it. Now this duty is set forth by our Church, and the people are taught and exhorted to practise it in three conspicuous places of our public service,—in the daily morning and evening prayer, in the service for the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, and more particularly on one most solemn day in the year—the first day in Lent, when, with fasting and mourning, and praying, we cast ourselves down before the Lord, and beseech him "to spare all those who confess their sins unto him."

So much for the duty of confessing our sins unto God. But still farther: there is a confession of sins frequently remarked upon and suggested by Scripture—I will not say commanded—but suggested and advised for the overburdened conscience of the sinner, and that is, in the words of St. James: “*Confess your sins one to another.*” Even as David did to the prophet Nathan: “I have sinned against the Lord.” This also our Church suggests. In the dangers of the body we consult the physician, in the intricacies of our estate we consult the lawyer—to both we lay bare our secret distempers and grievances, and tell forth all our sorrows. Why not then, in the case of our immortal souls, in the case of our *spiritual* distempers and burdens, go in search of some friend and adviser, some counsellor and guide, to whom we may disclose our wounded spirit, and search for help and comfort? I do not conceive that there can be to the sinner a greater comfort in many cases, than to have the privilege of some spiritual friend to whom he may, for the sake of humiliation and chastisement of himself, and so returning unto God, confess the sins he has committed; so that where there are scruples of conscience or weakness of faith, a guiding judgment may be interposed, directing the steps which wander, and controlling the doubts which may distract.

There is a sort of sympathy between man and man, an intuitive desire to impart to others what

we have ourselves, whether the secret we possess be good or bad ; if good that we may impart joy, if bad that we may receive compassion ; and this natural instinct will not suffer us to hide anything within our own breasts for any length of time,—*it compels us to disclose it.* Thus conscience has been known to hunt the murderer from city to city, and from hiding-place to hiding-place ; and when all human danger has been passed, and the crime forgotten, still this conscience has lain upon the sinner's heart so heavily, that he must needs, though death should be the consequence, tell forth his misery to some one. He must have some one to share his grief, he must have some one to hear his misery, he cannot stand alone. The very disclosing of his guilt, at all hazards and to any one, is a relief to his terrified and burdened spirit. Now our Church knows this quite as well as the Church of Rome, and she provides for it in her services, with as much care, but with more affection towards her people. Observe what she says in the invitation to the Holy Communion read on the Sunday preceding that holy service :—" If there be any of you, who by this means (i. e. by private examination) cannot quiet his own conscience herein, let him come to me, or to some other learned and discreet minister of God's word, and *open his grief;*" and then it speaks afterwards, of "ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubt-

fulness." But even more than this; for let us look at the office for the Visitation of the Sick. You will find this rubric: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." So that it cannot be brought against our Church (as it is frequently by the Romanists) that we deprive our people of this great spiritual comfort of confessing our sins one to another: it cannot be said, that any sinner, in doubt, in ignorance, or in misery, is not permitted to seek out his spiritual friend the priest and pastor of the flock wherein God's providence has placed him, to seek him out for ghostly counsel, and to receive from him advice, direction, and comfort, according to the exigency of his case. So far is it from being not permitted, that it is made a matter constantly of private invitation to the sick, and public invitation to those, who being sinners, would return to God and communicate in the holy Eucharist.*

* Bishop Jewell remarks on this confession of sins in its double sense, towards God, and towards man. Of the latter he says: "The other sort of confession made unto men I do not condemn; it may do much good, if it be well used; St. James commendeth it among the faithful.....The use and practice hereof is not only to be allowed, but most needful and requisite, if so be the superstition and *necessity* and conscience which many have fondly used and put therein, be taken away; but that the priest should hear the private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings,—that every man should *be bound* to their auricular

So far then the Church of England ; and herein all that we say, and all that we do, adheres most strictly and most purely to the ancient customs of the Church universal,—that is, of the Church before that period when Rome introduced her innovations. To prove this to your satisfaction, we must give testimonies from the ancient writers, and from the customs of the Church which we have on record ; and in these passages now to be quoted, I would beg your attention carefully to watch the words in which this testimony is conveyed, because upon the construction and meaning of the words will be seen the distinction which has arisen between ourselves and Rome. That private confession of sins, and seeking counsel of God's minister in spiritual difficulties, was an allowed custom of the early Church, in certain cases, St. Austin tells in the following passage : “ Can we say that one brother may cleanse another from the contagion of sin ? Yes, we are taught to do it by the mystical meaning of this work of our Lord [washing the disciples' feet], that we should confess our sins one to another.” And in another place he says : “ We are admonished throughout the whole Scripture to confess our sins conti-

confession,—is no commandment or ordinance of God. It is devised and established by men, and was lately confirmed by Innocent the Third. The Church of God, in the time of our elder fathers, was not tied to any such necessity.”—*Bishop Jewell on the Sacraments.*

nually and humbly, not only to God, but to holy men, and to those that fear God.”* You will observe that all through these words the confession recommended is upon the ground of a mutual sympathy between man and man, not forced, but for relief, and certainly not in any light of a *sacrament*. But again, Origen mentions the subject, not as a command of Scripture, not for the purpose of a sacrament or as an ordinance, but for *advice*, just as our own Church does : “ Consider what the Holy Scripture teaches us, that we should not conceal our sin within our own breast. If men hide and conceal their sin within themselves, they are inwardly oppressed, and almost suffocated with the phlegm and humour of sin ; but if any one become his own accuser, and confess his sin, he digests and removes the cause of his distemper. Only be circumspect in the choice of him to whom it will be fit to confess thy sin ; see that he be one that knows how to be weak with him that is weak, and to weep with him that weeps ; one who understands the discipline of condoling and compassionating,—so that at length, if he hath showed himself to be a skilful and merciful physician, and give thee any counsel, thou mayest observe and follow it.”* And so he goes on at great length, but all through, as you will

* Augustin, Tract 58 in Joan. tom. ix. p. 164 ; and Hom. 12, tom. x. p. 161.

† Origen, Hom. 2 in Psalm xxxvii. tom. i. p. 471.

observe, as a matter of advice and friendly comfort, voluntary and of free-will, not as a sacrament necessary to salvation. In a similar way, Cassian speaks of it, and Gregory of Nyssa. They speak of the beauty and of the value of seeking the advice of holy men, and particularly of the ministers of God, that they may pray together, that they may mourn and lament together, and that the tears of one may be mingled with the tears of the other, and go up before God as the joint supplication of brethren, the one for the pardon of the other. Thus Cassian: "If men possessed with dulness of spirit be themselves unapt to do that which is required, they should in meek affection seek health at the least, by good and virtuous men's prayers unto God for them."* And Gregory says (the last sentence is extremely beautiful, as showing what might be the affection and interest, the close spiritual love of the pastor towards wandering sheep)—he says: "Humble thyself, and take unto thee such of thy brethren as are of one mind, and do bear kind affection towards thee, that they may together mourn and labour for thy deliverance. *Shew me thy bitter and abundant tears, that I may blend my own with them.*"† Many such passages might be cited, all showing that the confession of sins one to another was

* Cassian, Coll. xx. c. viii.

† Greg. Nyss. Oratione in eos qui acerbe judicant.

considered as a work of affection and of ghostly comfort,—not forced, not sacramental ; but put before the sinner for his choice, as one of the greatest comforts of his religion, and one of the highest privileges of the Church ; on the very principle that St. James admonishes us : “ Confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.”

But we must now turn to the Church of Rome. And what shall we find here ? Shall we find in her such tender care and love for her children, as we have shown to ours ? Shall we find confession of sins set before the people as a consolation, a privilege, to be used with liberty of choice, and the affectionate friendship and sympathy of God’s minister ? How far otherwise ! Instead of being left to the choice of her people, it is compulsory ; instead of being a matter of love, it is a matter of the most odious tyranny and exaction on the part of the priesthood ; instead of being a matter by which sin may be checked, sorrow comforted, and virtuous minds strengthened, it is a matter by which sin is propagated into a thousand channels, which otherwise would not have existed ; and delicate minds wounded, and vicious minds hardened into a tenfold more obstinate career of sinfulness than they had before. Instead of being an office of free-gift from God, wishing to call sinners to Himself, that their minds may be re-

freshed and relieved, it is a matter of penal suffering and misery, laid out before them as by a tyrant, not a mother, with the heavy anathema of the Church crushing and bearing down the bruised spirit, by asserting that it is a sacrament necessary to salvation, and, without it, eternal life will be lost.

But I must not merely inveigh against this ;—it must be proved. Let us turn then to the fourth Lateran council. We shall there find this decree : “ Let every believer, of both sexes, after he has come to years of discretion, faithfully make solitary confession of all his sins, at least once in the year, to his own priest. . . . otherwise let him while living be denied entrance into the Church, and at death be deprived of Christian burial.”* And again, in the council of Trent : “ If any shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted, and is necessary for salvation by divine right, or shall say that the custom of confessing secretly to the priest alone. . . . is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, and is of human invention, let him be accursed.”† And then what this confession is to be,—how minute, and close, and searching into every secret thought,—is more fully defined thus : “ It is plain that the priests cannot exercise judgment without knowledge of the cause, nor can they observe equity in enjoining penalties,

* Conc. Lat. iv. Canon. xxi.

† Conc. Trident. of Repentance, Canon vi.

if men declare their sins only generally, and not rather *particularly* and *separately*”—and afterwards it is said, “even though they be *most secret*.” And afterwards again: “But since all mortal sins, *even thoughts*, make men the children of wrath, and the enemies of God, it is necessary to seek from God the pardon of all with open and modest confession.” Here then we have the public authoritative decrees of the Roman Church; and as to their *practice*,—the extent and wickedness to which it is carried,—the danger of it, and temptation on all sides, both to priests as well as people,—the foul and indecent thoughts which must be engendered and fostered,—nay, even things suggested which would not otherwise have existed, owing to the minuteness of the examination with which the confessional is charged,—all these things are so well known, as set forth in Burchard’s decrees, and still later in Dens’ Theology, that it needs no great stretch of wisdom to pronounce that the Romish doctrine of the confessional has done more to promote vice and undermine religion, than any other device invented by human beings, and certainly than any device invented under the garb of Christianity.

But lastly, it remains for me to show that these decrees of the Romish councils are mere modern inventions;—that auricular confession, as taught and practised by the Romanist, is nothing more than one of his additions to the faith. And this

we do most readily ;—first, by negative testimony ; and secondly, by positive proofs from writings of the ancient Fathers. But we must bear in mind, while we do this, the broad distinction already observed between *our* confession and *theirs*. For the confession taught by the Church of England, we have already shown our proofs. Carefully distinguishing between such proofs as were then given, applying only to *ghostly counsel and advice*, applying only to such confession as might prove a spiritual chastisement to the sinner, *of his own free choice*,—carefully distinguishing between *that* sort of confession and the Romanist doctrine of *compulsory confession*, wherein every thought and secret of the heart is to be laid bare by examinations and questions of the priest—let us now proceed to the testimony of the Church which so abundantly stands against them.

First, I said there was *negative* testimony ; and this in itself is a very great proof. For if they assert that auricular confession is part of a sacrament necessary to salvation, it ought to stand on good, open, well-known grounds. It ought to appear both in Scripture and in the Fathers,—so stated in Scripture as a doctrine, and in the Fathers as a practice. But it is quite the contrary. There is no one single passage—except the one, “Confess your faults one to another,” which does indeed make for *our* confession, but not for theirs ; for it does not show a sacrament. Then as to the

Fathers. The Romanist does indeed cite some passages which seem to bear upon the point ; but such passages, when examined, refer solely to the public penance, which the discipline of the early Church practised, not in reference to sin, but in reference to lapsed heretics,—in reference to those who in the time of persecution fell away from the faith, and then afterwards sought for re-admission into the Church. For such as these the Church did appoint a peculiar process of penance, and very frequently the penitents had to search for the priests and ministers of God, to make known their case, and to consult with them ; but then in no wise did this apply to private sins,—in no case did it refer to anything but this public falling away from the faith ; and this public falling away was always to be remedied by a *public* confession, a *public* recantation, and a *public* undergoing the penitential discipline of the Church.*

* The whole dispute as to the antiquity of confession to the priest, will turn upon this point,—whether the confession was private or public, as stated in the text. All the Romanist writers, in advocating their private auricular confession, ground their arguments upon the ancient "*Exomologesis*," which we all allow to have been the custom of the Church ; but then we assert, in contradiction to them, that this "*Exomologesis*" [confession] was always a public matter of Church discipline, and did not regard any secret communication of sins to a private priest. Thus Bingham speaks of it : "The learned Albaspinæus very

No. On the contrary, treatises upon penitence, homilies, comments, epistles of the Fathers,

strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. Cardinal Bellarmine, Baronius and Maldonat, and others, lay it down as a certain truth that the Fathers generally take the word '*Exomologesis*' for private and auricular confession; but having long and accurately considered all the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come into their opinion. The Fathers," adds he, "always use this word when they would describe the *external rites of penance*, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other like things, which penitents usually practised in the course of public penance; for no one can be ignorant that, in those first ages, penitents performed a long and laborious penance, wherein they mortified themselves with continual weeping, and stood before the gates of the Church, to give public testimony of their sorrow for the sins they had committed. Moreover, that they cast themselves on the ground at the bishop's feet, and fell down at the knees of the martyrs, and besought all the rest of the faithful that they would become intercessors to God for them, being clothed in sackcloth, and covered with filthiness and horror; and that when they had gone thus far in their penance, the bishop was used to bring them from the doors into the church, and set them before the presbyters, the deacons, the widows, and all the people; where again they were used to prostrate themselves on the ground, detesting their sins, and commending themselves to the prayers of all, and solemnly protesting that they would never relapse or return to their former condition again." This he proves and confirms by many irrefragable testimonies out of Ter-

abound ; yet nowhere is such a practice mentioned as auricular confession.

This is our negative testimony. But the positive testimony is equally clear.

tullian, Cyprian, and other ancient writers, which I shall not here relate, only allege one passage of Tertullian, which comes home to the present purpose.

“ The Exomologesis is the discipline of a man’s prostrating and humbling himself. It obliges a man to change his habit and diet, to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to defile his body by a neglect of dress and ornament, to afflict his soul with sorrow, and to change his former and sinful conversation by a quite contrary practice. To use meat and drink, not to please his appetite, but only for preservation of life ; to quicken his prayers and devotions by frequent fastings, to groan and weep, and to cry unto the Lord God both day and night, to prostrate himself before the presbyters of the Church, to kneel before the friends of God, and to beg of all the brethren that they would become intercessors for his pardon.” All this the Exomologesis requires to recommend a true repentance. But there is not a syllable of private or auricular confession, but all relates to a *public confession before the Church*, and that not so much in words as in actions, expressing their repentance by public demonstrations of sorrow and the uniform tenor of a penitent behaviour, which was of far greater moment to signify and evidence their conversion, than the most pathological words of any mere verbal or private confession. — *Bingham’s Antiquities*, book xviii, c. iii.

It is in reference to some such public discipline as the above, in which public and notorious offenders might be openly reconciled to the Church, that our Communion Service was devised ;—not with any object to restore the

St. Chrysostom says (A.D. 398): "I bid thee not to bring thyself upon the stage, nor to accuse thyself unto others, but I advise thee to observe the prophet's direction. Reveal thy way unto the Lord; confess thy sins before God; confess them before the Judge."* Again, in another place he says: "It is not necessary that thou shouldst confess before witnesses; let the enquiry after thy sins be made in thy own thoughts. Let this judgment be without any witness; let God only see thee confessing."†

St. Basil says (A.D. 328): "I do not make confession with my lips, to appear to the world, but inwardly in my heart, where no eye sees. I declare my groaning unto Thee alone, who seest in secret."‡

private auricular confession of Rome, but that the public penitential confession of the sinner might be profitable to himself, and admonish others.

"Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that, at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend. Instead whereof [and here the Church expresses her opinion], until the said discipline may be restored again, *which is much to be wished*, it is thought good," &c. &c.—*Communion Service*.

* Chrysostom. Hom. 31 in Hebr.

† Hom. de Pœnitentia.

‡ Basil in Ps. xxxvii.

Again, St. Ambrose (A.D. 374): "Tears wash away sin, which men are ashamed to confess with their voice. Weeping provides at once both for pardon and bashfulness. Tears speak our faults without horror. Tears confess our crimes without any offence to modesty, or shamefacedness."*

Again, St. Austin (A.D. 395), speaking of the Psalmist's expression, "I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and so thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin," remarks that here forgiveness was promised by God, even before any confession was really made, but directly upon the *intention* to do so arising in the mind. "I said, I *will* confess my sins." "His confession was not yet come to his mouth; yet God heard the voice of his heart."†

Add to these writers the following decree of the council of Cabaillon (A.D. 813), which, even so late as this, held language at least of doubt on the subject: "Certain persons are accustomed to confess only to God, but others think that sins ought to be confessed to a priest, both which customs exist in the Church, not without great benefit. So only let us confess our sins unto God, as He is the forgiver of them; and with David let us say, 'I have made my crime known unto thee.' But let us confess our sins to one another, accord-

* Ambrose, lib. x. in Luc. xxii.

† St. Austin in Ps. xxxii.

ing to the institution of the Apostle, and pray for one another, that we may be saved.”*

Add all these things together. Then seal them by the total silence of Scripture, and the confessed acknowledgment that, as an institution, it could not have come from Christ ;—and we shall, I hope, be satisfied that it is, as we declared just now, a mere addition of Rome. That of which Scripture is silent, and the Fathers testify against,—that of which we find a council in the ninth century speaking of merely as a voluntary act,—cannot certainly be said to form any part of a sacrament of the Gospel.

Here then we must conclude the second portion of that which is called in the Church of Rome the Sacrament of Penance.

For ourselves : when we consider the many well-known evils which have arisen out of compulsory auricular confession, I do not see any reason to regret, that it is discontinued among us as a necessary article of the Church’s discipline. On the contrary, I should consider it the highest exercise of tyranny and abuse of the power of the priesthood ; I should consider it as militating against all that is pure and holy among men ; I should consider it as of necessity tending to de-

* Conc. Cabaillon, Canon xxxiii. This direction exactly agrees with the observations before made on the *Anglican* doctrine of confession.

moralize and vitiate both priests and people, were it to be in any way enforced, as a matter essential to salvation. But at the same time, were we to exclude it, were we altogether to reject the penitent, however burdened and overwhelmed with sin he might be, and however anxious to relieve his mind and humble himself before God, by telling out the misery which oppressed him;—were we to turn our backs on his sorrow, and refuse to take part in the burden of his sin,—be ready to give no counsel, to furnish no advice, but like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ears, turn aside from the voice of human affliction, come in whatever way it might,—how then should we be fulfilling the high office of the minister of Christ, “*weeping with them that weep*?” how then should we be following the example of our Lord and Redeemer, who said, “Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden and I will give you rest”? Our Church then wisely takes her position between the two extremes. She permits, nay more, she solicits, the confidence of the penitent: she certainly would make the Priest of England, quite as much as the Priest of Rome pretends to be, the friend and adviser, the brother, the father of his people. More so; for in the one case it is done for the aggrandisement of the priesthood, while in the other it is done for the blessing of the people. Our Church would really wish to make the priest, whom she sets over the people, that which he

is usually *called*, but of which few understand the full meaning, the pastor—the good shepherd—so that like Christ he might know his sheep, and his sheep might know him, and hear his voice and follow him, and go in and out and find pasture. She would say, “From your baptism even to your grave, from the first moment you become, under the sign of the cross, a member of Jesus Christ the Lord; you have a friend, a teacher, a counsellor, a guide, in the appointed minister of that holy Church into whose membership you come. If you fall into poverty, he stands by; if you fall into sin or shame, he stands by; if you are tempted to forsake God’s holy laws, he stands by; if Satan with all his subtleties and skill should ever be too strong for you, and at last you break from the pledges and the bonds of God’s holy covenant, still he stands by, and is ready to say to you, as from God; first, ‘Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand:’ and secondly, ‘Comfort ye, comfort ye my people.’”

Consider how many sinners may have gone on in sin,—how many young hearts may have been hardened in a confirmed profligacy and hatred of God,—how many tender spirits may have pined away in solitary doubts and misgivings—how many death-beds may have witnessed the concealed torments of an uneasy conscience, urging on the sinner in all the horrors of despair towards that fire that is never to be quenched—all of which might

have been alleviated, the first habit of sin checked, the weak parts of character strengthened, the faulty parts weeded out or amended, had this blessed privilege of the Church been remembered according to the words of St. James: “*Confess your sins one to another.*” All this, my brethren, might be done. This free intercourse of friendship between minister and people on points of religious duty, and anxieties of conscience, and difficulties of faith—all this is what our Church *desires*. It is what our Church *would do*; but always, remember, subject to the free choice of every individual.

But not so the Church of Rome. This work of *love* on our part is turned into a work of *terror* on hers. Hers is the minute, painful, inquisitorial examination of a hard and tyrannical taskmaster—ours of a gentle mother. While we say: “We advise you for your own comfort, if you need ghostly counsel, to come to us and ask it;”—she says: “We command you by all the anathemas of the Church.” While we would urge it with words of sympathy, as a free and voluntary offering;—they would force it with all the anathemas of eternal woe, as though heaven’s gates, unless *they* stood at the threshold, could never be opened to the perishing soul of man.

SERMON VIII.

ST. JOHN XX. 23.

“Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.”

PENANCE, as it is called in the Church of Rome a *Sacrament*, was observed to contain four constituent parts: *Contrition, Confession, Absolution, and Satisfaction*. The two former of these, showing the distinctive errors of Romanism in their doctrine of attrition, and their forced auricular confession, we have already considered. It remains for us now to take up the two latter.

And first—*Absolution*. The doctrines of confession and absolution would naturally agree together. If we found error in the one, we should look for it in a corresponding degree in the other. If we found the priesthood of Rome arrogating to themselves unjust and unscriptural authority in exacting the private confessions of their people, we should in a corresponding degree expect some

similar exactions on their part in regard to a power to remit or retain, to bind or loose those sinners whose confessions they might hear. And just so it is. In considering this question, suffer me to lay before you first, the Scriptural doctrine of the absolution of sins,—then to show you the common ground of agreement which there is between the two Churches in this doctrine,—and then to point out the additions, and therefore the errors, of Romanism.

All who are Christians, even those in the very lowest rudiments of Christianity, must be aware that the whole spirit and essence of the Gospel consists in the fact of an absolution of sins. The Gospel is in truth one great sacrament or mystery of absolution. For the world was in such a state of disobedience to God,—mankind had so forgotten and turned themselves away from their Creator, that His wrath was upon them all, without distinction of persons, and condemnation and death was the universal curse of man. For this came the Messiah into the world, with that which was especially called “*good tidings.*” For this he preached repentance,—for this he called back the wandering souls of men, “binding up the broken-hearted, proclaiming liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound ;” and his whole character was that of a messenger to the nations of release and freedom from some universal bondage. Thus it is said of St. John

the Baptist, that he was the forerunner of Christ, “to give knowledge of salvation unto his people for *remission of their sins* ;”—and as that was said at the outset of the Gospel, even before the birth of Christ, so it was in the same manner said at the close of the Gospel, after his death—“that repentance and *remission of sins* should be preached in his name among all nations.” Remission of sins is then the distinguishing leading character and mark of the Gospel dispensation. Now, should we not expect that this leading character or mark would develop itself in the details of the administration of that Gospel? We should. Its traces are manifest all through. While on earth—there was the Saviour himself, according to the principle announced of “peace on earth, good-will towards man.” He forgave sins—asserted his power to do so, and worked miracles to show that he had the power to do so. And when he died, he took such measures as might continue uninterruptedly the same all-merciful doctrine. He took measures by which men might be continually reminded of the peculiar mark of that Gospel whose disciples they were. To prevent the possibility of this remission of sins passing out of the minds of men, he appointed a Church, and he appointed sacraments. He appointed a *Church* which should be for ever a living memorial of himself, “his own body,” in union with him; so that by means of that Church the remembrance of that doctrine

might never fade away. And so he called chosen men together, his beloved apostles, and “breathed upon them, and said, whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.” He instituted moreover *sacraments*—particularly Holy Baptism—which was especially said to be for the remission of sins, and to this baptism he appointed all men to go—who would be saved. By this baptism he would have every soul that sinned, washed and made clean. By the outward sign, water, and the inward grace, regeneration, he brought it to pass that the wrath of God should pass away from mankind, and the sinner be absolved, justified, and saved.

Here then we have the standard doctrine of the absolution of sins, as announced in the Gospel, developed in its practical administration. First in Christ himself, then in the apostles, then in the Church built on their foundation, himself the corner-stone,—and all this to be continued throughout all ages, by reason of the Church to be continued throughout all ages, and the sacraments within that Church, of never-ceasing efficacy.

But now comes the question,—In *what sense* do the Church and the sacraments contain within them the remission of sins? In the same sense as it was promised by Christ. Jesus said to the apostles,—“Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are

retained." In another place,—“Even as my Father hath sent me, so send I you;” and in another place,—“Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” Putting these three places together, we infer that it was Christ’s desire to continue this virtue of remission of sins through the apostles *in their successors*, for ever, “even unto the end of the world.” But still, *in what sense?* (for this is the point at issue), not surely in such a sense that the apostles or their successors should be the judges, arbiters, or disposers of the remission of sins,—not surely in such a manner that the officers of the Church might of their own individual power decree remission or withhold it, and so take it out of the power of God;—no, but in this manner,—as authorised heralds and publishers of it from God. Not that they are mere channels or instruments of its conveyance, in themselves inert and passive until God moves them. They *have* a certain discretion and a certain power, but that power is limited, and that discretion is responsible to the authority from which it comes, and in all cases reverts back to it for confirmation. To call the ministers of God mere channels of the communication of his grace would be too low a notion of their office; to call them absolute arbiters and judges of his grace, would be too high a notion of their office. Take the medium between these two, and you will find that which God’s word desires them to be. We

might illustrate it by the case of an ambassador who comes from one court to another. He has authority to declare and make certain announcements—which announcements are not his own—but the king's who sends him. Those announcements may be left in his hands with a discretionary power to use them or withhold them according to certain contingencies which may or may not arise; and the use of this discretionary power vested in him may still have to refer back again to the court from whence he came, for confirmation:—so that having the power of making the announcement, and having the power of judging the right time of making the announcement, would be quite compatible with the notion still remaining in his office, that the announcement was not his own, but his who sent him. Just so in absolution. Absolution of sins,—that is the announcement. The minister ordained of God for that purpose, and sent,—that is the ambassador. This ambassador is certainly trusted by God with discretionary power to make the announcement or withhold it, as he may see fit, in consequence of contingent circumstances. But though he may have this discretionary power, it by no means follows that the power of the actual absolution is in the minister of God;—it is not the actual power, but solely the *power of declaring it*. This then is the true Scriptural light in which the power of the keys is vested in the officers of the Church, and this must

be the sense in which those remarkable words were given to the apostles and through them to all priests in succession of the apostles : “Whosoever sins ye remit (*i. e.* declare to be remitted) they *are* remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain (*i. e.* declare to be retained) they *are* retained.”

Let us now consider whether our own Church, in her formularies and public documents, will bear out this view of the question. Our Articles do not speak on the subject ; but, turning to the ordination service, we shall soon find an unequivocal testimony of what has just been said. Let us take the solemn words with which the bishop and presbytery, with laying on of hands, address and invest him who is about to be ordained a priest : “Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained ;”—and with this authority, the priest going forward to his labour, finds three forms by which he is empowered to carry that authority into effect. Examine these three forms, and you will find them all more or less declaratory, or ministerial ; not usurping the authority of God, but merely declaring the authority of man, vested with a *commission* from God. The first occurs in the ordinary morning and evening prayer, in which, after confession of sins, the priest reciting

that God has given him "power and commandment to declare and pronounce remission of sins," then does declare it, and says: "*He*," *i. e.*, God, "pardoneth and absolveth." The next form occurs in the Communion service,—rather stronger in its expressions, but still declaratory, or rather, we might say, a union of a declaration with a prayer: "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins, have mercy upon you," *i. e.*, "may He have mercy upon you—pardon and deliver you from all your sins," &c. The third form is in the Visitation of the Sick. This certainly is the strongest in its language, and more partaking of the doctrine of personal authority than either of the other two forms; but still, when we consider that it is only to be used on special occasions, when full confession of sins has been made, and when the sinner himself desires it,—under these peculiar circumstances,—it stands well as a testimony of our Church to the full power of her priesthood, when such cases demand it. It first recites the fact of the Lord Jesus Christ having left such power in his Church, and it then goes on to state that on that authority the absolution is pronounced: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the

Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In addition to these three forms, you will also find absolution mentioned in connexion with the ministerial office, in the invitation to the holy communion. The former part was alluded to when we spoke of confession: "Let him come to me, or some other learned and discreet minister of God's word, and open his grief." But the words go on, so as to describe the object of such an opening of the sinner's grief; namely, "that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice."

And in this view all our great standard divines conspicuously agree. They all bear testimony to the meaning of absolution as I have endeavoured to explain it above; some indeed taking much higher ground than others, but none falling short in attributing to the priesthood a full ministerial power in declaring an absolution of sins. The three following may be taken as examples, being writers of different character, and speaking at different times.

First, *Hooker*: "It is true, that our Saviour, by these words, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted,' did ordain judges over our sinful souls, gave them authority to absolve from sin, and promised to ratify in heaven whatsoever they should do on earth in execution of this their office; to the end that hereby as well his ministers might take

encouragement to do their duty with all faithfulness, as also his people admonition, gladly with all reverence to be ordered by them; both parts knowing that the functions of the one towards the other have his perpetual assistance and approbation. Howbeit all this, with two restraints which every jurisdiction in the world hath—the one, that the practice thereof proceed in due order—the other, that it do not extend itself beyond due bounds; which bounds or limits have so confined penitential jurisdiction, that although there be given unto it power of remitting sins, *yet no such sovereignty of power, that no sin should be pardonable in man without it.* Thus, to enforce our Saviour's words, it is as though we should gather that because whatsoever Joseph did command in the land of Egypt, Pharaoh's grant is, it should be done; therefore he granteth that nothing should be done in the land of Egypt but what Joseph did command, and so, consequently, by enabling his servant Joseph to command under him, disabled himself to command anything *without Joseph.*"*

Secondly, *Bishop Taylor*: "The priest is the minister of holy things; he does that by his ministry, which God effects by real dispensation; and as he gives the Spirit, not by authority and proper efflux, but by assisting and dispensing

* Hooker, Eccles. Polity, book vi.

those rites, and promoting those graces, which are certain dispositions to the receiving of him; just so he gives pardon; not as a king does it, nor yet as a messenger, that is, not by way of authority and real donation, nor yet only by declaration, but as a physician gives health, that is, he gives the remedy which God appoints, and if he does so, and God blesses the medicines, the person recovers, and God gives the health.”*

And thirdly, *Bingham*. He describes four sorts of absolution: the sacramental, the declaratory, the precatory, and the judicial; but by the judicial he means, not any power of adjudging men in reference to God’s kingdom *in heaven*, but solely with reference to ecclesiastical discipline—the loosing or binding according to the civil or canon law. And thus he speaks:—

“Of all which [these four different sorts of absolution] the ministers of Christ are constituted discretionary judges, invested with powers to examine both men’s faith and morals, and to exclude the scandalous and profane, and to re-admit the truly penitent, upon their giving evident tokens of a real conversion, and bringing forth fruits meet for repentance. They are Christ’s substitutes and vice-regents in his Church, binding and loosing, opening and shutting with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, *which, so long as they are accord-*

* Bishop Taylor, Works, vol. ix. p. 258.

ing to the rules prescribed them by Christ, their sentence, *though only ministerial*, is of great effect in the external communion of the Church at present, and will be found to be of force as a prejudging forerunner of the sentence of the last day : for under these limitations, and *reserving a due prerogative to the infallible sovereignty of Christ*, it cannot be doubted but that “whosoever sins they remit, they are remitted ; and whosoever sins they retain, they are retained.”*

Thus much for the Church of England. It is easy to perceive how high the grounds are upon which she rests her claim to the power of the keys—sufficiently high to give her all useful and spiritual authority for the benefit of her children, but never presuming for one instant to look beyond her character as that of a servant, herald, or ambassador. And now let us turn to the Church of Rome. Agreeing with us up to this point—agreeing with us as to the power of the priesthood to make a declaration of God’s pardon to penitent sinners—to make a ministerial and

* Bingham, *Nature of Absolution*, Sermon i. p. 4. In all this let us be very careful to remark that there is in *our* doctrine of absolution, as distinguished from Rome,—one essential particular,—a full and penitential spirit, a real faith and trust in the absolving power coming from God, in the *receiver*. The external words of the giver will not be sufficient, without the internal spirit of the receiver. God *may* dispense with the former, and absolution may be gained without it ; but *He never dispenses with the latter*.

authoritative, and if necessary, and in peculiar cases, a private absolution for the penitent—agreeing with us so far, she goes on to make it a *judicial* absolution—not judicial in the sense before used—of an ecclesiastical judgment, but in a spiritual sense, in reference to the kingdom of God. “Not only have we,” says the Church of Rome, “not only have we the power to *pray* for the penitent sinner’s absolution, or to *declare* it, or pronounce it *ministerially*, but we have the power to *judge* whether the sinner is forgiven or not. The sinner is forgiven through our words; *we* are the persons who do it, or cause it to be done. If *we* judge one way, that the sins of the sinner are to be remitted—or another way that his sins are to be retained, so it follows;—our word suffices.”

Now it is evident, however high our own doctrine may be said to go, as just explained, it cannot be said to go so high as this. It is a very different thing to say, “I *declare* the absolution,” from saying, “I *give* the absolution;”—to say, “I am the *channel* by which, and the *servant* through whom, absolution is given you,” from saying, “I, of my own knowledge, judge and decree you to be forgiven.” And yet this is what the Church of Rome asserts to be within her authority, adding to the faith of the primitive Church and of God’s word, and therefore in error. And this we shall see from the council of Trent. That council declares the opinion of the Romish Church in the

following words : “ Although a priest’s absolution is the dispensation of a benefit conferred by another, yet it is not a mere naked act of ministry in announcing the Gospel, or declaring that the sins are remitted, but is like a judicial act, in which *sentence is pronounced by him as by a judge.*” * And this is confirmed by several of their writers. One I will mention, Bellarmine, who thus exalts the priesthood in this portion of the penitential action. He says : “ Christ has made his priests *judges* upon earth, with such power, that, without their sentence, no person falling into sin after baptism can be reconciled. If they could be absolved without the sentence of the priest, then the promise of Christ would not be true : ‘ Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted.’ ” * By which we see that the power of forgiving is actually taken out of God’s hands. It seems to make man to judge the matter with authority without reference to him who gave the authority. It seems to take away all the spiritual and internal portions of the doctrine of repentance, and rest it upon the mere pronouncing of a few words by a sinful man like unto ourselves. By this, no contrition or grief of heart, no turning away from sin committed, with however penitent a sorrow, can avail, until the intervention of the priesthood ; — thus changing

* Conc. Trident. Session xiv. chap. vi.

† Bellarmine de Pœnitent. lib. iii. cap. i.

things spiritual into things formal, robbing God of the honour due unto his name, and elevating sinful man as a judge and king into the place of the omniscient Searcher of all hearts.

To show that this doctrine is contrary to the primitive and Catholic Church, and that it was never heard of in the purer times of Christianity, I shall just lay before you one or two quotations from the early Fathers, and so conclude this portion of our subject. First, St. Jerome (A. D. 390) commenting on the words of Christ to Peter,—“ I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven ; ” —commenting on these words, St. Jerome says,—“ This place some bishops and priests not understanding, take upon them some of the superstitiousness of the Pharisees, so as to condemn the innocent, or think to acquit the guilty ; whereas God inquires not what is the sentence of the priest, but the life of the guilty. In Leviticus, the lepers were commanded to show themselves to the priests, who neither *make* them leprous nor clean, but they *discern* who are clean, and who are unclean. As therefore there the priest makes the leprous man clean—[clean in the eyes of the law by the pronouncing his sentence]—so here does the bishop or priest bind or loose, *i.e.* accord-

ing to *their office*.”* And so, in another place, he says,—“Men exercise their office in the remission of sins, but they do not exercise any power, for the sins are not forgiven in their own name, but in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Men pray, but God forgives. It is man’s supplication, but the gift is from God.”† The same thing may be observed in regard to the remission of sins in baptism. St. Austin says, (A. D. 395)—“The office of baptizing, the Lord granted unto many, but the power and authority of *remitting sins in baptism*, he retained unto himself alone.”‡ And so St. Cyprian says, (A. D. 248), —“The sins that are committed against him, he alone hath power to forgive, which took upon him our sins, he who sorrowed and suffered for us, he whom the Father hath delivered unto death for our offences.§ Add to this the fact, that in the early Church all absolutions were given in the form of a prayer, and never in the form of “*I absolve thee*.” Prayer and imposition of hands were the only signs used by the Church in the early ages, as may be seen from abundant testimonies. Prayer as the means of procuring, and imposition of hands as the out-

* Jerom. in Matt. cap. xvi. lib. iii.

† Idem de Sanct. Spir. lib. iii. cap. xix. But this latter work “on the Holy Spirit” is only a translation from Didymus of Alexandria, A.D. 370, whose pupil Jerome was ;—so that in this latter passage we have a double testimony.

‡ August. Scal. Parad. cap. iii. § Cyprian de Lapsis, cap. iv.

ward sign of declaring; but in all cases, the source and judge, the author and giver of the pardon, no one but Almighty God himself.* So that from all this we conclude, that the Romanist doctrine of the priest having power to be the judge in absolution, is an addition to the faith,—

* There is a form of absolution in St. James's liturgy, wherein we find the words "*Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth*" introduced as the authority for absolving sinners; but this authority, all through the absolution, is strictly in the form of a prayer. It was used with imposition of hands for returning penitents, in the following beautiful form :

"O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the living God, thou shepherd and lamb that takest away the sins of the world, that forgavest the debt to the two debtors, and grantedst remission of sins to the sinful woman, and gavest to the sick of the palsy both a cure and pardon of sins,—remit, blot out, and pardon our sins, both voluntary and involuntary, whatever we have done wittingly or unwittingly, by transgression and disobedience, which thy spirit knoweth better than we ourselves. And whereinsoever thy servants have erred from thy commandments in word or deed, as men carrying flesh about them, and living in the world, or seduced by the instigations of Satan, or whatever curse or peculiar anathema they are fallen under,—*I pray and beseech thy ineffable goodness to absolve them with thy word*, and remit their curse and anathema, according to thy mercy. O Lord and Master, hear my prayer for thy servants. Thou that forgettest injuries, overlook all their failings, pardon their offences, and deliver them from eternal punishment. For thou art he that hath commanded us, saying, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*"—Liturg. Jacob. in Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 23.

an addition not heard of in the Church until the twelfth century, even in the form "I absolve thee," and not confirmed and made a doctrine until the tenth century. We reject it, therefore, for three reasons;—first, as contrary to God's power, and derogating from his high attributes of sole dominion over the creatures whom He has made; secondly, as contrary to primitive antiquity; and thirdly, and above all we reject it, because it is found contradicting *the Word of God*.

We shall now approach the fourth part of that which is called, in the Romish Church, the Sacrament of Penance,—namely, *Satisfactions*.

Any ordinary person would think,—looking at the description which the Gospel gives us of repentance,—that when we had fulfilled those three parts of it which we have now described—contrition, confession, and absolution,—there could be nothing more remaining. Neither would there be if we understood repentance rightly. But men do not understand repentance rightly; while some err in adding that which does not belong to it, others err in detracting from it a great portion of its essence and virtue. Men of the present day have, in general, very superficial notions of repentance. They leave it very frequently under the notion of a mere mental affection,—sorrow, grief, remorse, and the like,—without entering into the question of any personal

or bodily demonstration of its fruits. We surely could not suffer a penitent, however contrite, however much confessing, and however fully receiving the ministerial or sacramental absolution, to go away with a notion that he had thereby done all that was required. Only consider what the effect would be. Sin was committed yesterday; confession is made to-day; absolution will be given to-morrow; and then a return to sin might take place the next day. And so the same round had only to be repeated time after time, until our life might pass onwards in a mockery of all true religion, and we were found at the bed of death with one long retrospect of sin and disobedience against God, broken only by this solemn and reiterated abuse of the highest privileges and mercies of the Gospel of our Lord.

Surely this would not do. This would not be called true evangelical repentance. Looking to Scripture, we find that repentance is described as conveying necessarily as its immediate consequence, a return to holiness. "Bring forth *fruits* meet for repentance," saith John the Baptist; or, as it is translated in the margin of our Bibles,—"*fruits, answerable to amendment of life.*" Therefore, it has always been considered as vitally forming a constituent part of true penitence, that good works must accompany and follow it. Something there must be tangible and visible to demonstrate the feeling within,—something there

must be in forsaking the past, and turning unto God in action; before the penitent can in the eyes of God be fully restored to his original state. On this ground, in our daily absolution, we ask of God, after the pardon is pronounced, that “the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy;” and in our Communion service, we speak of ourselves as “bewailing and lamenting our sinful life, acknowledging and confessing our offences, and seeking to bring forth worthy *fruits* of penance;” and these worthy fruits are more fully described in our homilies, as consisting of fasting, more frequent prayer, abstinence from the world, alms-deeds, and the like. And all this is but consistent with our natural feelings. If we have done wrong to any man, it is our *nature* (that is, if our minds be rightly formed), it is our nature to show, even by an exaggeration and going beyond what is absolutely required, that we are really and sensibly affected by the wrongs that we have done. We are glad to seize every and all opportunities to prove to the *satisfaction* of the injured person that our minds are now at last really well affected towards him.

This I take to be the ground-work upon which has been built the Romish theory of *satisfactions*, as forming a part of penance. Upon the admitted and right principle of good works forming a true sign, and a necessary consequent of evangelical repentance, they have gone on, exaggerated and

changed the whole character of such good works, and have converted them from being mere proofs of sincerity into works of merit ; from being mere consequents of a mind honestly turning unto God, into public exactions under rules of the priesthood, to satisfy and appease the wrath of God, which otherwise, they say, would burn against sinners as before.

The doctrine of Rome is thus. When men sin, they incur the wrath of God. When they repent and turn back again to God, and receive the sacrament of absolution, they are forgiven, but still not altogether. There are two punishments due to sin,—one is the eternal punishment of hell, the other is temporal punishments on earth. Now, by the sacrament of repentance, the eternal punishment is remitted, but the other punishment—temporal punishment—still remains due. They say that “penitential works, such as fasting, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power of averting that temporal punishment ; that it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try *to satisfy this divine justice*, by the voluntary assumption of such penitential works, as God’s revealed truth assures us to have efficacy before him.”* That this is the real doctrine of the Romish Church, we have only

* The words in inverted commas are the words of Dr. Wiseman, Lectures, vol. ii. p. 41.

to go as before to the council of Trent ; we shall there find the following decrees :—" If any shall say that the whole penalty is always remitted by God, together with the guilt, and that the only satisfaction of penitents is *faith*, whereby they embrace that Christ has made satisfaction for them, let him be accursed." Again—" If any shall say that the keys of the Church were only given to loose, and not also to bind, and that therefore the priests, when they impose penalties upon those who make confession, are acting contrary to the end of the keys, and contrary to the institution of Christ, and that it is a fiction to say, that when eternal punishment has been removed by the power of the keys, there remains for the most part some temporal punishment to be discharged,—let him be accursed." Again—" If any shall say that as regards temporal punishments, men can by no means, through the merits of Christ, make satisfaction for sins by the patient endurance of punishments inflicted by him, or enjoined by the priest, or voluntarily undertaken, such as fastings, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, and that so a new life alone is the best repentance,—let him be accursed."*

Here, then, the whole doctrine and meaning of *satisfactions* is made clear. It all arises from the notion that God punished man in two ways—

* Conc. Trident. Of Repentance, Canons xiii.-xv. Our Church contradicts this doctrine in her 11th, 12th, and 13th Articles.

eternally and temporally. Certainly we know that there are afflictions in this world, and those afflictions are called in Scripture chastisements from God; but then we also know that those chastisements are not sent in wrath, but in love; and so St. Paul says,—“The Lord loveth whom he chastiseth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.” These chastisements,—either pain of body, or loss of temporal goods, or sickness, or sorrow, are all tokens,—if “we are walking by faith and not by sight,”—they are all tokens of God’s exceeding love, they are signs that God is dealing mercifully with us, as a father with his children, that He is thereby weaning our affections from things which would essentially harm us, or lead us into sin; that He is drawing us nearer to Himself, and preparing us, as by a discipline, for his future kingdom in heaven. This is *our* view, and it is the Scriptural view of the afflictions which visit mankind in this world.* But not so

* There must indeed be certain *consequences* of sin in this world, even after repentance, however sincere; there must be the ordinary course of the world, and of human action and of human opinion. This must of necessity go forward, unless stopped by miraculous interference; but these *consequences* are not signs of God’s wrath, farther then that general expression of His will that sin will have certain effects. Thus in the case of David. This case is often cited by Romanist writers, as an example, showing that the wrath of God, according to their doctrine, still remained in the death of his child, even after he had said, “The Lord hath put away thy sin.” The *consequence* of

the Church of Rome. This is the *wrath* of God in their estimation. This shows how angry, and how jealous God is against sinners, and how difficult it is to appease Him, and how His fury burns like fire against the children of men, and although He will remit and forgive the main portion of their punishment in his future kingdom, yet in *this* world He must needs satisfy his anger a little farther, before He will finally be gracious. And therefore, upon this ground, says the Romanist, "Anticipate God. In return for those sins, which you acknowledge, and for which you know there is temporal punishment hanging over your head, find out something to appease Him. It is true Christ died for your sins, but Christ's death only atones for your *eternal* punishment. You must do something *yourself* in regard to the *temporal* punishment." So then the priest devises what this shall be. He apportions it by his judgment according to the sin confessed. He asserts

the sin went on, it is true ;—the consequence went on, in point of time, subsequently to the forgiveness,—but only in point of time. It was God's mercy and chastisement, not God's *wrath* ;—it was His discipline which was given, to show David for his future conduct a rule and guide, by which he might the better restrain himself within the limits of God's law. How know we, if the child had not died, and so particularly signified God's presence in the transaction, whether David might not have sinned again ? Anything which should so impress a man's mind with the idea of God's hatred of sin, as to draw him away from sin, is surely a mercy, not a sign of wrath.

thereby his knowledge of what is sufficient, or not sufficient, to satisfy God. He, though a mortal man, asserts that he has acquaintance with the counsels of God, so as to be able to pronounce what quantity or quality of atonement shall compensate for sins committed, and so he measures out and weighs the desired satisfactions,—certain stripes upon the body, or wearing of sackcloth, or cords ; certain mortifications or austerities ; certain alms-deeds ; so much to be given to the church here, or to the monastery there ; or, what is still more extraordinary, certain prayers to be repeated by beads or rosaries, a certain number of times. These, and such like things, he says, will satisfy God.

And now I have little more to do, than just to show you how gross a perversion all this is of “ the truth as it is in Jesus,”—and then conclude.

It will need but very little discrimination to make the distinction between our doctrine of the good works of repentance, and theirs. It will be readily seen that the Scripture doctrine, of bringing forth “ *fruits meet for repentance*,” as signs and tokens, as proofs and necessary consequences of repentance, has nothing to do with these exaggerated additions, of esteeming such fruits *satisfactions* to appease a portion of God’s wrath. The early fathers are continually reminding us of the necessity of the former, while they scrupulously guard us against the errors of the latter. That in the

times of penitence,—both public as in Lent, or private as in the return from any special sin unto God by individuals,—we should discontinue our usual habits, put on special signs of mourning and woe, give up our bodies and our souls to fasting and deeds of charity, and works of pious labour in the Lord ;—all this, as useful, and becoming a true penitent spirit, the early Church, and our Church, desires.* And these St. Cyprian urges upon the lapsed Christians, denouncing the notion that men were to consider repentance to consist of mere sighs and tears, and go on in their usual course of life as though nothing whatever had happened. Denouncing this, he beautifully says : “ Can we think that that man laments with his whole heart, and deprecates the Lord with fasting, weeping, and mourning, who, from the very moment of his sinning, daily frequents the baths, who feeds himself with luxurious feasting, and fills his belly to an extraordinary pitch, and imparts not his meals and drinks to the necessities of the poor ? How does that man bewail his own death, who walks about with a merry and cheerful countenance, who trims his beard, and attires his face ? Does *he* think to please men who displeases God ? And how does that woman lament and mourn, who is at leisure to put on her costly clothing, and never thinks of the garment of Christ, which she has lost ?†

* See the Homilies on Good Works, Fasting, &c. ; and the 12th Article.

† St. Cyprian de Lapsis, p. 135.

But this is far, very far, different from esteeming any such things as *satisfactions*.

i. Consider first,—how the very notion of it undermines all the generous attributes of a merciful and benevolent God, which we know our God must be. Is mercy a quality that can be divided into halves? Is it an attribute of mercy to say to the poor and contrite sinner,—“I remit you the principal part of your punishment, but to gratify my revenge I shall retain a portion.” *Is that like God?* Even in man,—what a little, paltry, ungenerous spirit should we say was in *his* heart, who, when his enemy confessed his guilt, and bowed down before him in abject acknowledgment of his error, would then cry out,—“I shall *forgive* you, but I shall, for my revenge, and the satisfaction of my just anger, inflict upon you a certain degree of punishment nevertheless.”—Would that be the spirit of forgiveness? “God,” saith St. Basil, “is no ways passionate, but because the punishments which His judgment doth inflict are the effects of indignation severe and grievous to such as suffer them, therefore we term the revenge which He taketh upon sinners anger, and the withdrawing of his plagues mercy.” “His wrath,” says St. Augustin, “is not as ours, the trouble of a mind disturbed and disquieted with things amiss, but a calm, unpassionate, and

* Basil. Hom. in p. 37.

just assignation of dreadful punishment, to be their portion which have disobeyed; *His mercy a free determination of all felicity and happiness unto man, except their sins remain as a bar betwixt it and them.*”* “So that,” continues Hooker, commenting on these passages, “when God doth cease to be angry with sinful men, when He receives them into favour, when He pardoneth their offences and remembereth their iniquities no more (for all these signify but one thing), it must needs follow that all punishments before due in revenge of sin, whether they be temporal or eternal, are remitted.”†

But principally consider that great doctrine of the Christian Gospel—that essential feature of all we read and hear in God’s holy word—the *atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. Is not the sin of human beings, the original sin, the actual sin, the sin of every day, every aspect and condition of sin, described in Scripture as to be atoned for and compensated by the sacrifice of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ? Is there any exception or proviso, any bar or hindrance mentioned in Scripture, to shut out from the soul of the true penitent the full effect of this atonement? Now the effect of this atonement is *justification by faith*.—Is *justification*

* Augustin, tom. iii. Ench. cap. xxxiii.

† Hooker, Eccl. Polity, book vi.

in Scripture represented as partly belonging to the merits of Christ, but partly also belonging to the merits of man? Surely not. Behold the contradiction which such a doctrine contains within it, both to itself, and to everything we ever read in holy Scripture. To itself,—for how can he who is so far forgiven all his sins as to be fit for the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven,—so far forgiven, as to be restored to the favour of God in things eternal,—and so be *justified*,—how can he be at the same time subject to God's wrath in things temporal, and so be *unjustified*. It is a contradiction to itself; but it is moreover a contradiction to Scripture, which especially cautions us against admitting our own good works as any claim to God's good will,—“When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants,”—which assures us continually, that when God forgives sin he forgives it altogether, as in Isaiah: “I am he that *blotteth out thy transgressions* for mine own sake, and *will not remember thy sins* ;” which especially bids us to put aside all other sacrifices as any means of appeasing God's wrath, either sacrifices of the law, or sacrifices of nature; saying to the Hebrews, that *those* sacrifices, sacrifices of *our* offering, could never “make the comers thereunto perfect; but this man, Christ, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.” As he took away all

sacrifices that preceded him, and forbad them to be any longer satisfactions to God, so he took away all sacrifices that might come after, and concluded all the ways, manners, and devices which men might imagine out of an ignorant nature, or out of a proud nature, to be meritorious ways of reconciling themselves unto God, or God unto them, in the *one satisfaction* of his death upon the cross, “to wit, that God was IN CHRIST, reconciling the world unto himself,” and not imputing their trespasses any longer unto the fallen, but forgiven, children of men.

SERMON IX.

REVELATIONS xiv. 13.

“Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord ; from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours.”

IN the Church of Rome there are two different sorts of sin. Some sins are called *venial*, and others are called *mortal*. The mortal sins are those of a highly aggravated and determined character—violent and actual breaches of God’s holy law—such as murder, adultery, blasphemy. But venial sins are those lighter and more accidental deviations from purity, which must occur more or less in every man’s daily life, such as idle words, jesting, anger, wandering thoughts, and the like.*

* “*Mortal* sins are they which absolutely turn us from God, and merit eternal punishment ; *venial*, those which somewhat impede our course to Him, but do not turn it, and are with little pains blotted out. The former are crimes, the latter sins.”—*Bellarmin. de Amiss. Grat. i. 2.*

“*What is mortal sin ?* It is that which of itself brings spiritual death to the soul, inasmuch as of itself it deprives the soul

Now it is very important to observe this distinction, because, when we consider the Romish doctrine of the sacrament of penance, as explained in the preceding lecture, we find, that although confession of the mortal sins, even to a thought, is absolutely required, yet, that confession of venial sins is passed by: "As to *venial* sins," says the council of Trent, "by which we are not excluded from the grace of God, and into which we more frequently fall, although they *may* be declared in confession, yet they may be passed over in silence without offence, and can be expiated by *many other remedies*."* The question is, what are these other remedies?

We saw before, in the doctrine of *satisfactions*, that in order to appease or mitigate the wrath of God, the Romish people are taught that they must submit to certain penitential sufferings. They are taught that when they fall into mortal sin after

of sanctifying grace and charity, in which the spiritual life of the soul consists. *What is venial sin?* That which does not bring spiritual death to the soul, or that which does not turn away from its ultimate end, or which is only slightly repugnant to the order of right reason. These are venial sins, or so slight sins, as in *just men* may consist with a state of grace and friendship with God.—*Dens' Theology*, in loco.

They differ in kind and in degree. In *kind*,—as a lie told in jest,—*venial*; a blasphemy against God,—*mortal*. In *degree*; the stealing of a penny,—*venial*; and the stealing of a hundred pounds,—*mortal*.—*Dens' Theology*, in locis.

* Concil. Trident. chap. v. Session xiv.

baptism, they must have recourse to the sacrament of penance, and then their mortal sins are forgiven by Almighty God, at least as far as the next world is concerned. His *eternal* wrath is *satisfied*. But still there is a residue of the wrath of God—his *temporal* wrath, and this remains to be atoned for by penal suffering in *this* world. So much then for mortal sins. But what of *venial* sins? What of those every-day little inadvertent sins, to which no one can apply any specific repentance from their minuteness—and yet which, however minute, render us unholy in the sight of God, and short of that perfection which he demands? Why, says the theology of Rome, they must be added, and though not coming under the sacrament of penance, yet they must be added in the mass to those remains of mortal sin, which have to render satisfaction to God in *this* world.

Now see what follows, according to this theory. We must consider ourselves as continual debtors to God from day to day and from hour to hour; and although our confession be sincere, our hearts contrite, and we do all that is in our power by fruits of repentance, nay, go farther than mere fruits or good works—if we even go so far as to mortify and afflict and punish ourselves to appease God's anger, still on and on this debt proceeds. One or two or three mortal sins may be possibly so measured as to have a certain atonement rendered, but then you must add your *venial* sins ;—

but since these are fresh accruing every day—since every hour you live there are new ones, it must follow that every hour, nay, every moment, your debt increases, little at first, yet by continual and never-ceasing additions, it becomes in extent and magnitude fearfully large, so that all attempts to atone for it, are ultimately useless. Under God's wrath, therefore, every sinner must of necessity live and die. Do what he will with the sacrament of penance, obtain God's pardon as he may by the absolution of the Church, as far as *eternity* goes, yet this *temporal* satisfaction remains to be performed. But inasmuch as venial sin (putting mortal sin out of the question), inasmuch as venial sin, must, from its nature, advance in a much greater ratio than any penance man can make to counterbalance it, so it must come to pass, that at *death* every man must unavoidably find himself under the wrath of Almighty God.

How then are we to be released from this difficulty? Is every human soul to perish for ever? Is God's wrath of such a character, that, notwithstanding the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and notwithstanding the pardon of God obtained in heaven, and sin remitted, yet still, by reason of the deficiency of satisfaction to be rendered, we shall never attain the glorious regions of eternal life with God? No; we can easily resolve this question, says the Church of Rome. There is after this life, and before the souls of the righteous

ascend to heaven, a peculiar state of existence, which we call PURGATORY. All the satisfactions which are due to God for the sins of men, both mortal and venial, which cannot be made up during life, must be made up in *purgatory*. Every man will have need to go through this peculiar state of existence, because every man will have need more or less of some purgation. In this purgation the satisfactions remaining due to God in life will be accurately examined into and demanded. The account will be made up—God's justice will be satisfied—and then the justified Christian being set free, will be ready for his abode in heaven. *Purgatory*, therefore, is our answer to all difficulties which might be suggested as to the souls of the righteous obtaining their everlasting state of glory.*

From this we shall understand how the Romish doctrine of *purgatory* is of necessity dependant on the Romish doctrine of *satisfactions*, and why it is that I take this subject next in order, as flowing naturally out of the sacrament of penance.

* Thus Dr. Wiseman says : "From the subject of Satisfaction I naturally proceed to the consideration of another topic, intimately connected with it,—the [Roman] Catholic doctrine of *Purgatory*. The [Roman] Catholic doctrine of Satisfaction would be incomplete without it. The idea that God requires satisfaction and will punish sin, could not go to its farthest and necessary consequences, if we did not believe *that the sinner may be so punished in another world, as not to be wholly and eternally cast away from God.*"—*Wiseman's Lectures* ; II. On Purgatory and Satisfaction.

My first endeavour will be to show that there are some common principles in connexion with this subject, in which we cheerfully agree with the Church of Rome, and then I shall explain how the doctrine of purgatory, by adding to these principles, is erroneous and contrary to Scripture.

That there must by the very nature of things be *some* intermediate state of existence between this life and the life which we shall pass with God in heaven, appears to be very clear. A very few arguments will suffice to show it. In the first place, the Scripture tells us that after death there shall be a judgment, and it tells us that this judgment is not to take place upon every individual person immediately that he dies, but that the whole nations of the world, all people, and of all times, shall be congregated together, so that separation shall be made of the goats and the sheep, and then their final sentence be pronounced. If, then, judgment is to be passed upon the deeds done in the flesh, and this judgment is to await the final consummation of all things, “when the trumpet shall be sounded, and the dead be raised incorruptible,” then it evidently follows that in *some place or other*, the souls of men must be detained, while their bodies rest in corruption in the grave, waiting for this final consummation. Again, we can see the necessity of this notion from the account of our blessed Lord’s death and resurrection. We read that on one day his holy

body was laid in the grave, that on the following third day he arose from the dead. The body, we know, must be separate from the soul in death; the soul, therefore, of our blessed Lord, as perfect man, must have been somewhere in that intervening time, separate from the body. This "somewhere," we describe, in the Creed, by the word "*Hell*," meaning thereby the place of departed spirits. We say of Him that he was crucified, dead, and buried, then descended into Hades, the place of good spirits; and then rose again from the dead, the soul returning from that place to the body, and being again united, bringing back human life in the glorious resurrection. The same thing is inferred from the address of our Lord to the penitent thief, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." The same thing again from the account of Dives and Lazarus, the place in which Lazarus was abiding being "Abraham's bosom," a place of rest and tranquillity, as opposed to Dives in a place of torment, burning, and misery.

And this notion, which we can so clearly deduce from the Scriptures, and from the nature of the thing itself, is abundantly confirmed by the testimony of the Fathers. Justin Martyr says (A. D. 140): "All souls do not die, but the souls of the pious remain in some *better place*, and the unrighteous and wicked in a *worse place*, expecting the time of judgment."* And Irenæus says

* Dial. cum Tryph.

(A.D. 180), commenting on the scriptural account of Dives and Lazarus: "By this it is plainly declared that souls continue to exist, and that the different sorts of bad and good receive a *fitting habitation*, even before the day of judgment."* Here, then, we have the testimony of antiquity confirming and witnessing what has been deduced from the Scripture, establishing clearly our opinion that there is *some place* whither departed souls go, waiting for the day of judgment.

But just as in all other things, Rome steps in, seizes upon this acknowledged doctrine of an intermediate state, and in order to make it tally with her preconceived doctrine of satisfactions, declares that it is not, as Scripture says, a place of rest and happiness, but a place of purgatorial torment and suffering. Now, if she had said that there was a distinction of place—that there were two places, one for the righteous souls, and one for the wicked, as it was in the case of Dives and Lazarus, we might have understood it; but when she says, that the souls of the wicked go at once into the flames of hell fire, while the souls even of those who have had their sins remitted as far as heaven is concerned, and therefore justified, must still go into a place of cleansing, to *suffer* something before they can see God—it certainly must be pronounced an addition to the Catholic faith. In order to prove this, I shall now set

* Irenæus adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. xxiv.

before you the public documents of the Romish Church, and some passages from their private writers, and by this I shall soon satisfy you of the extent of what they mean by their doctrine of Purgatory.

The first council that even mentions the subject of Purgatory is the Council of Florence (A.D. 1438). "In the name of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. With the approbation of this sacred General Council of Florence, we decree,—that if any true penitents shall depart this life in the love of God, before that they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance for faults of commission and omission, their souls are purified after death by the pains of purgatory."* We shall observe here three things: first, that the person is supposed to be a *true penitent*; secondly, that he is supposed to depart in *the love of God*; and thirdly, notwithstanding this love, and the truth of his penitence, he is to suffer PAINS of purgatory. To such inconsistency are men driven, when having made one erroneous doctrine, they strive to mend it by another. The next public document of Rome on the subject of Purgatory is in the Council of Trent: "Whereas the Catholic [Roman] Church instructed by the Holy Spirit out of the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, has taught in the Sacred Council, and lastly, in this General Synod,

* Conc. Flor. Session xxv.

that there is a *Purgatory*, and that souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the living, and, above all, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, this holy synod enjoins on Bishops to make diligent efforts that this sound doctrine concerning purgatory, handed down from the holy fathers and sacred councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the disciples of Christ.”* Now in this decree of Trent, there is certainly nothing said as a *definition* of purgatory. That it is a place of pain, as in the Council of Florence before cited, this decree of Trent does not mention ; that it is a place of fire, or torture, or penal suffering, it does not mention ; it merely says that there is such a place, and that souls are detained there. Hence it happens that in controversies with Romanists, when you place before them the enormities of their teaching in reference to the penal sufferings of the souls in purgatory, they always appeal to this decree, in order to soften down the inconsistencies and errors which they are teaching.

We must, therefore, on our side, look not only to this decree itself, in order to get a true notion of what they mean by purgatory, but also to their writers which shortly succeeded this Council, to the opinions of those who wrote expressly as commentators and explainers of their faith. When we do this, we soon understand what is meant by

* Conc. Trident. Session xxv.

it. That which was dark and undefined, is soon explained by such documents as the Catechism of Trent, and by such writers as Bellarmine, Bonaventura, and others.

The Catechism of Trent thus explains the matter: "There is a purgatorial fire, in which *the souls of the pious are tormented* for a certain time, and cleansed, in order that an entrance may be opened for them to their eternal home, into which nothing defiled can enter." In this, two additional points are mentioned;—that there is in this purgatory a "*fire*," and that the "*souls of the pious are tormented*." Going on again to private writers, we find Bellarmine writing thus: "Purgatory is a certain place in which, as if in a prison, souls are purged after this life, which have not been fully purged in it; so that, being thus purged, they may be enabled to enter heaven." And again: "It is certain that in purgatory, as also in hell, is a *punishment by fire*," "*the very same sensible punishments which the sinner ought to have suffered in hell*, with the exception of its eternity."* Bonaventura says: "Sins may be remitted, not only in this world, but in purgatory; and since there is no room there for deserts or for sacraments, *punishing or cleansing fire* is called in aid." Other writers tell us that it is "a real cor-

* Bellarmin. de Purgatorio, lib. ii. cap. x.; and De Pœnitentiâ, lib. iv. chap. i.

poreal fire, and that it tortures *incorporeal* souls.”* Others describe the souls as in a gloomy prison, *struggling in many tortures*.† Even in the catechisms which they set before the young for instruction at this very day, their doctrine is still the same. For instance, in the Douay Catechism it is thus : “ Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied the punishment due to their mortal sin? A. To Purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them; and then to heaven.”‡ Or again : “ Q. What is Purgatory? A. A place of *punishment* in the other life, where souls suffer for a time, before they can go to heaven.”§ All this will be sufficient to explain to us the doctrine of the Church of Rome as to purgatory. I shall now endeavour to prove to you that it is an unauthorized and dangerous novelty; and I shall do this from three considerations. First, that it is against Scripture; secondly, that it is against the teaching of the Church; thirdly, that it is inconsistent with all the known attributes of God.

1. *First, that it is against Scripture.* It is true indeed that the Romanist will bring forward certain passages of Scripture, to favour the doctrine

* Natalis Alexander. Dissert xlv. in Sæc. iv. as cited by Mr. Palmer in his Letters to Wiseman.

† Benedict. de Sacrificio Missæ.

‡ Abstract of the Douay Catechism, p. 71.

§ Doyle's Catech. p. 35.

of purgatory ; but these passages will quickly be made of no avail, either by looking to the authority on which they rest, or by a close examination of their real meaning. For instance, they would bring forward the passage in the second book of Maccabees (xii. 45), where Judas makes a sin offering for certain men who had been slain ; inferring thence that the offering was made to redeem them out of purgatory ;*—but in the first place it is most likely that this sin offering was made for the living, as a token of sorrow to God for the sins which the whole people had committed in the persons of those men who had perished. And, in the second place, waiving this, the book on which it rests is apocryphal, and not allowed by the Catholic Church as of authority in matters of faith. Again, they would bring forward the first epistle to the Corinthians (iii. 13): “ Every man’s work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work, of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward ; if any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” This passage is explained by their commentators to refer to purgatory. A man, they say, is described as suffering loss—that is, punish-

* This place is given as the Scripture proof in Dr. Butler’s and Doyle’s Catechism. See page 35, *Dublin*, 1841.

ment—yet being saved, but by fire;—that is, being cleansed by means of fire; and being so cleansed, then entering into salvation. But again, by some of their own writers this text is put aside as insufficient, as being figurative, and not bearing on the point. Bellarmine himself confesses that it is insufficient. Some of the Fathers consider that the fire here mentioned is the fire of hell; while others interpret it to mean the tribulations of life. To which uncertainty we might add, as a point conclusive against it, that it describes the fire as proving *every man's work*. Now, by the Romish purgatory is meant, not a fire into which every man goes,—not the wicked or the impenitent,—but only the good and the pious. If it therefore mean any fire at all, it must be the fire of hell; but most likely it is no more than, according to St. Augustin's and St. Gregory's interpretation, the tribulations of the world, which are trials proving every man's faith. There are other texts brought forward; namely, the one from the first epistle of St. Peter (iii. 18-20), where it is said that Christ “went and preached to the spirits in prison.” But this is directly put aside by the consideration of the spirits here spoken of being *disobedient*; but the spirits in the Romish purgatory are *good* spirits,—those who have been forgiven by God, and only suffering in order to be purified for heaven. There is again one more text, in St. Matthew (xii. 32), relating to sin

against the Holy Ghost, in which mention is made of two different sorts of sin,—of which it is said that the one sort should be forgiven, but the other should “never be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.” By which it is argued, that since it is asserted that there are *some* sins *not* forgiven in the world to come, we may infer that there are some sins which *are* ;—therefore, if so, it must be before men actually arrive in heaven,—and yet it cannot be when they are actually in hell ;—therefore, it must be in *purgatory* that these sins are forgiven. Now this is a most strange inference upon which to found an article of faith. It is evident to every one of ordinary understanding, that this expression, “neither in this world, neither in the world to come,” can only mean, according to the Hebrew idiom, NEVER,—just as it is said in the parallel place of St. Mark, “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath *never* forgiveness.”

Now if the Church of Rome has need to apply to such passages as these for a defence of their doctrine, and can bring forward no better, we may be sure their defence is but weak ; and that when we look through the rest of Scripture, we shall find abundance of authority to contradict them. Accordingly, so it is. Look to those places already cited : “To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise.” This was said to one about to die. It was placed before him as a reward ;—there was no in-

tervening time, and no intervening place: "*To-day* thou shalt be with me in *paradise*." And in the case of Lazarus,—no intervening time is described, and no intervening place. Immediately after death, he was found in "Abraham's bosom." Again, take this passage: "The living know that they shall die, *but the dead know not anything*. Neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten; also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun."* What can more expressively describe the cessation of the dead from all the troubles, passions, cares and interests, belonging to a state of probation? But purgatory infers a state of probation. Again, in the same book, and to the same purpose: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest."†

But leave single texts, and take whole classes of them; those, for instance, which refer to the entire and universal satisfaction of Christ, and the cessation of God's wrath thereupon, not partially, but altogether. "There is therefore *no condemnation* to them that are in Christ Jesus;"‡ *i.e.* being justified by Christ, and through him forgiven, there is no relic of punishment anywhere awaiting them. "Being justified by his blood, we shall be

* Ecclesiastes ix. 5. † Ecclesiastes ix. 10. ‡ Rom. viii. 1.

saved from wrath through him.”* There is no wrath remaining ; we are justified and saved from it altogether. Again, take that class of texts which describe the day of judgment. “It is appointed unto men once to die ; but after this, the judgment.”† What an opportunity was there here for St. Paul to describe this intermediate state of probationary suffering, if there had been such ! Why did he not say, “It is appointed unto men once to die,—then to go through a state of purgation and cleansing in the fire of purgatory,—and then the judgment” ? But no ;—there is but one step, as far as sin as concerned, from death to judgment. Again, what is the meaning of all that class of texts which urge the necessity of repentance and good works, and turning unto God *immediately, in this life*, on the express ground that there is nothing farther to be done towards salvation *after this life* ?—such as : “We beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain,”—“Behold now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation,”‡—“Exhort one another daily while it is called to-day, lest any of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin ;” while it is said, “To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts ;”§ and the very words of Jesus himself, “I must work the works

* Rom. v. 9.

† Heb. ix. 27.

‡ 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2.

§ Heb. iii. 13-15.

of him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh, when no man can work.”* And once more, consider that class of texts in which death is spoken of as a period of delight and joy, and rest from labour, as though nothing after that remained of toil, or fear, or pain, or punishment. “We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” The heavenly tabernacle succeeds the earthly. There is no intervening *purgatorial* tabernacle. “In this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.”† How so, if purgatory, pain, and punishment had to intervene? “To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better.”‡ How so? It would not be a gain, if, after death, purgatory had to be suffered. Nor indeed would the thing desired be achieved, namely, to be with Christ; for Christ could not be in purgatory to meet the dying Christian there. And yet, once more, that remarkable and convincing passage which we have chosen for our text this day: “Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord.” Why? If a purgatory had to intervene they would not be blessed. But the Scripture tells us why: “*from henceforth,*” i.e.

* John ix. 4.

† 2 Cor. v. 1, 2.

‡ Philipp. i. 21-23.

immediately, “ yea, saith the Spirit, they rest from their labours.” Surely here is a mass of evidence from God’s holy word sufficient to overwhelm the most scrupulous, sufficient to blot out the word “purgatory” for ever from the language of Christianity.

II. But suppose all this to be set aside. Then let us at once go (because the Church of Rome is fond of appealing to antiquity)—let us at once go to the Fathers, and behold whether in them we can find this doctrine asserted or believed. One of the great arguments in favour of purgatory, from antiquity, is derived from the custom of praying for the dead. We cheerfully grant, for the testimony is universal, that in the early Church they did pray for the dead.* But there is a miserable fallacy in any argument from this, that therefore they prayed for the dead in *purgatory*. This is no more than assuming the fact that is to be proved. We agree, as before shown, that the dead are in some intermediate state, and we might allow for the moment that the prayers of the living in their behalf might be acceptable in God’s sight, and the

* There is no formal condemnation of prayers for the dead in our own Articles, nor in our liturgy. But their *disuse* in our Church is unquestionable ;—we *praise* and *bless* God for the dead in Christ, but we do not pray. In the ancient liturgies, however, prayers for the dead were universally used in the eucharistic service. See Bingham’s Ecclesiastical Antiquities, lib. xv. chap. iii. ; and Bishop Taylor’s Dissuasive, and also Archbishop Usher.

thanksgiving and memory of the living for the dead in Christ might be profitable to both parties, and signify to us the unity of the visible Church with the invisible, and draw us together unto God as one in Christ—just as in our own Church we daily thank God, and “bless his holy name for all his servants departed this life in his faith and fear.”* But does all this show that the dead are suffering *torments*, that our prayers are to be made to release them from *pains and sufferings*, to extricate them out of the *fire of purgatory*? Surely it is evident to every candid mind, that the two questions, however they may have been craftily mixed up together, have nothing of necessity to do with one another. On the contrary, in the very passages in which prayers for the dead are mentioned, the expressions are very frequently such as to convey a doctrine the very reverse of purgatory. The words continually speak of the souls of men in a state of perfect repose, not torment. For instance: Gregory Nazianzen says: “Let us commend to God our own souls, and the souls of those who, as men more advanced on the same road, *have arrived before us at their resting-place*.”* So that keeping clear of this fallacy, which the Romanists are fond of introducing into the question, let us now consider the following testimonies from the ancient Fathers:—

* Prayer for Church Militant.

† Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. in Cæsar. fin.

Irenæus (A. D. 180) :—

“ The presbyters who are the successors of the Apostles declare that those who are translated to paradise remain there until the consummation of all things. For there is a paradise prepared for the just, and for those who have the Spirit, into which Paul the Apostle was transported and heard unspeakable words.”*

Tertullian (A. D. 200):—

“ We do an injury to Christ when we hear with regret that any have been called away—as if they deserved commiseration. I desire, saith the Apostle, to be received presently, *and to be with Christ.*”†

Origen (A. D. 230):—

“ The soul, when it departs from the world, shall be disposed of according to its merits, enjoying the inheritance of eternal life and happiness, if its actions shall have obtained it.”‡

Cyprian (A. D. 250), speaking of those who were dying of the plague:—

“ That you behold righteous and wicked dying together without any distinction, is no reason for your supposing that destruction is common to good and evil ; for the righteous are called *to a place of refreshment*, the wicked are hurried to a place of punishment ; *shelter* is quickly afforded to the believing, but punishment to infidels.....

* Irenæus adv. Hæres. lib. v. cap. v.

† Tertullian de Patientiâ, cap. ix. p. 145.

‡ Origen. Præf. Lib. de Principiis, tom. i. p. 48.

The multitude of those who are already believers *is called to peace.*”* And in another place he says: “When we depart from hence there is no place left for repentance, there is no effect of satisfaction.”†

Gregory Nazianzen (A.D. 270):—

“To those who depart from this life there is no confession in the lower places, nor any correction of their former habits.”‡ And again he says: “I am persuaded by the words of the wise, that every soul which is good, and beloved of God, when loosened from the bonds of the flesh, *immediately* feels and contemplates the good which awaits it... and enjoys a certain wondrous pleasure, and rejoiceth, and joyfully goeth to its Lord.”§

Methodius (A.D. 290):—

“When this short transitory life is dissolved, we shall have our dwelling with God, *even before the resurrection.*”||

Athanasius (A.D. 330):—

“There is not any death to the just, but a change; for he is changed out of this world into an *everlasting rest*; and as a man goes out of prison, so do the good go out of this toilsome life, *to good things* which are prepared for them.”¶

Hilary (A.D. 355):—

“Our expectation of future good is this:—that

* Cyprian de Mortal. ix.

† Ad Demetrian, § xvi.

‡ Greg. Naz. in plagam grandinis. § Orat. vii. tom. i. p. 212.

|| Methodius de Resurrectione.

¶ Athanasius de Virgin. Paris, 1627, i. 1056.

going forth from the body to that entrance of the heavenly kingdom under the guardianship of the Lord, all the faithful will be reserved in the meanwhile in the bosom of Abraham, until the time arrives for their entering into the kingdom of heaven.”*

Gregory Nyssen (A.D. 370):—

Consoling a mother for the loss of her child:—
“Although thy child hath left thee, she hath departed to the Lord. She hath closed her eyes to thee, but opened them in eternal light. She hath departed from thy table, but hath been received at that of angels. The plant hath been removed from this, but hath been planted in paradise.”†

Ambrose (A.D. 375):—

“Death is in every way good, because it puts away those principles in us which war against each other; and because it is a sort of harbour for those who, after tossing on the wide sea of this life, seek for an anchorage of secure peace. Unwise persons fear death as the greatest of ills, but the wise desire it as *a rest after toils, and the end of ills.*”‡

Chrysostom (A.D. 400):—

“There is no comfort in the future world for that man whose sins are not washed away in this; for now is the time for care, and warfare, and strife—then, for victory, retribution, and reward.”§

* Hilary in Ps. cxx. † Greg. Nyss. Oper. tom iii. p. 517.

‡ Ambrose de Bon. Mortis. 4. § Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. v.

Macarius (A.D. 680):—

“ When the righteous depart from the body, the choir of angels receive their souls in their own place,—*in the pure world*, and so bring them to the Lord.”*

But why need we go on multiplying these passages? Almost every Father, in his genuine writings, will furnish similar testimony.† I shall only now wind up all that has been said by the admission of their own writers, by the admission even of Romanists themselves, that there is no authority whatever in antiquity for their doctrine of a purgatory. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, candidly confesses that this is the case, and says: “ The doctrine of purgatory was for some time unknown to the universal Church. It was believed by degrees, partly from the Scriptures, partly from revelations. Any one that pleases may read the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, and, as far as I know, he will find nothing said, or very rarely, about purgatory. Not even the Latins altogether, but by degrees acknowledged the truth of this doctrine.”* Alphonsus a Castro, in the same way: “ There is no mention of purgatory in the Greek writers; for which reason, to this day, purgatory is

* *Macarius*, Hom. xxii.

† If the reader is desirous of seeing farther passages, let him consult Mr. Palmer's sixth letter to Dr. Wiseman,—to which I am indebted for many of the above quotations.

‡ *Contra Luther*. Art. xviii.

not believed by the Greeks.”* Nay, the very Roman liturgy itself bears witness against itself. “Remember, Lord, thy servants and handmaids who have gone before us with the sign of faith, *and sleep in peace*. We pray thee that thou wouldest grant them, and to all *who rest in Christ*, a place of refreshment, light, and peace.” How can they “*rest in Christ*,” and yet be in the torments of purgatory? How can they “*sleep in peace*,” and yet be suffering the purging fire of that place which will not suffer them to see God’s glory, by reason of pains and torments which thousands of years will not terminate?

And now I hardly think that there is anything farther to be said. The whole may be summed up in a very few short sentences. This doctrine of purgatory is against *reason*, because it is impossible for those whose sins are once forgiven, still to remain in a state of wrath. It is against the *Scripture*, which so fully describes the translation of the dead in Christ at once to peace. It is against the voice of *antiquity*, which accords, as it must needs do, with the voice of God. It is against all the peculiar features and doctrines of Christianity,—undermines all virtue and goodness in man,—calls in question God’s justice,—puts a doubt in the way of God’s mercy,—violates the one great atonement made for us by Jesus Christ upon the cross, and sends us to our graves, instead

* Advers. Hæres. lib. viii. Verb. Indulg.

of being blessed, tranquil, and happy in the prospect of a release from the trials of this present world,—fearful, full of doubts, trembling, not knowing how much pain we shall have to endure, nor how long,—not knowing what punishments, what torments, what miseries, we are about to plunge into, without help, without God, without Christ.

I say that it undermines all virtue and goodness in man,—for what motive is there left for us to “fight the good fight of faith,” if purgatory be true?—to struggle against the bitter temptations of this wicked world,—to mortify our carnal lusts,—to subdue the flesh,—to clothe ourselves in the new man, which is after Christ,—what motive, when, after all that we do, after all our prayers, after all our aspirations unto God for His holy spirit of grace, to comfort, prevent, and succour us,—still there lies before us this unpassable, unavoidable barrier of purgatory, full of wrath and woe, to threaten our bed of death. Thousands and thousands of years, they say, may await us in purgatory. Can poor finite man look into such a period as this? Can he imagine that he is to be “tortured by flames like those of hell,”* “tortured by devils,”† “the pains most atrocious, not to be compared with any pains that we have suffered in this life”‡? Can poor finite man look into this with patience? Is it likely that he can bear it (if

* Bellarmin.

† Bouvier.

‡ Bellarmin.

he believes it), and then go on his way, struggling against his nature, loving God, and striving to serve him,—blessing God, and working righteousness,—as though all this were really nothing? No. To a really sincere, sensitive, Christian spirit, must not the end of such a prospect be despair,—ruthless, forlorn despair? He would cast aside his efforts,—he would fling up the contest as a vain thing. He would say, “Away with it; I shall be, after all, very little better than the damned;—then with the damned I will take my place in this world’s pleasures and sins, such as they are, and enjoy them while I can.”

Then I said, it violates God’s mercy; for is it merciful that the Almighty should thus deal with man? Is it consonant with that universal sign of benevolence which we see in all his works here upon earth?—in the air we breathe, the creatures we behold, the sensations of happiness and joy that we have all around and about us;—that keen sense of delight in virtuous actions,—that something still and silent within us, that makes our hearts continually leap up within our breasts, in a sort of triumph, at a good deed done;—is all this, which we feel even here, to be marred, set aside, and crushed for thousands of years, in this fire of wrath? That surely would not be the same God of mercy after death, that now we feel Him to be before death;—that surely would not be the same God that is described in Scripture as “the Lord which exerciseth loving kindness,” “God is love,”

“He is the God of peace,” “the father of mercies, the God of all comfort and consolation,” “who openeth His hand, and giveth us richly all things to enjoy;” like as a “father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him;” “He will not always be chiding, neither keepeth He His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy.” I say, this God that is so described in Scripture, would not be any longer the same God in purgatory, forgiving nothing, sparing nothing, but ransacking every corner of our hearts for every venial sin, and suffering us not to go forth from prison till we have paid the uttermost farthing.

Then I said, it violates the great atonement made for us by Christ Jesus our Lord. For certainly though God is a God of mercy, he yet must be a God of justice also, and something must be suffered. *Some one* must pay the penalty of sin. But it has always been thought that Christ has done this. It has always been thought that were man, and the whole race of man, to be cast, from the moment of each one individual’s birth, into the fire of hell, it would not be sufficient to appease the wrath of God for human sin;—that so great is the violation of obedience, that sufferings however long, or however deep, would be no atonement, no not even a feather’s weight, against the great scale of justice, kicking the beam against us,—and it has always been thought, that it was for no other reason than just this, that Christ by dying on the cross came to make atonement, and that when He

did so, our attempting to do so any longer were futile and absurd. Yet all this notion is at once destroyed and abandoned, when we find ourselves, poor miserable sinners, seeking out our own salvation, balancing all our debts, and repaying all our delinquencies and sins by a measured portion of pains and penalties in the cleansing torments of a purgatorial fire.

How can all this be? Does it not show, even upon the very face of it, some foul invention of the evil one, to deceive and bewilder man? Go to the Romanist, live with him a life of all goodness, and honesty, and faith; be penitent, be contrite, confess your sins, receive absolution, do all the Church bids you, and be all that God would have you to be; be justified, be sanctified, be full of the Holy Ghost—and then die:—what then? Notwithstanding it all, where are you? Pains, sufferings, wrath, woe, is your portion; no peace, no rest, no tranquillity, for you cannot get to heaven but through PURGATORY. But come to our Catholic Church, come with us to *our* Scriptures and *our* teaching, to *our* creeds and *our* sacraments; and then,—after a calm, penitent life, and with a sober gentle spirit, when you have done the works that are set before you, breathing out your soul in a tranquil faith before your God and your Redeemer, what shall *we* say to you? We shall bid you die in hope, even as you have lived in faith; we shall bid you be of good courage, for

that the "*Lamb of God*" hath taken away the sins of the world; and tell you, that you are fully and without reservation reconciled unto God in His blood; we shall bid you speak your last word in joy, and breathe your last sigh in peace; we shall fold your hands in rest beside you, and close your eyes upon this frail and perishable scene in gentle repose; and we shall then carry you forth to the grave, and laying you in the dust, shall say this prayer beside you:—

“Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, ARE IN JOY AND FELICITY, we give thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world, beseeching thee shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

SERMON X.

PSALM xlix. 7.

“None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.”

WE are still speaking of those errors in Romish teaching, which arise from the so-called sacrament of Penance. It was explained that one of the four constituent parts of that sacrament, was called *satisfactions*; by which was meant the duty of all Christians, after confession of their sins and absolution received, to perform certain works of piety and suffering, either voluntarily undertaken, or imposed by the priesthood. It was explained that these works were imposed upon sinners, on the principle of appeasing God's wrath; for although the Sacrament of Penance might, through the merits of Christ, obtain a remission of God's *eternal* wrath, yet that there remained his *temporal* wrath still to be satisfied. It was explained, that sin is, according to their theology, of two sorts, mortal and venial; that mortal sin, con-

sisting of great and violent crimes, and being of necessity confessed to the priesthood, receive their appointed works of satisfaction through the medium of that confession—but that venial sins, consisting of all the minute and accidental deviations from strict rectitude, which no man can remember, cannot and need not be confessed to the priest—but still, though venial, they must, together with the greater sins, be subject to God's wrath; and so temporal punishment hangs over them, necessary to be suffered, before God's justice can be satisfied. It was explained also, that since from this necessary position in which all men must find themselves before and at their death, they could never receive salvation,—God's wrath being unappeased, and satisfactions still due,—the Church of Rome was in a difficulty; being thus guilty of shutting out the great portion of mankind entirely and for ever from the kingdom of heaven; but that out of this difficulty they quickly extricated themselves, by inventing the doctrine of *purgatory*—a state of existence which they fondly describe as between this life and the kingdom of heaven, in which righteous souls work out the remainder of the satisfactions due to God, and so are at rest; and at this point, *purgatory*, as flowing out of the sacrament of penance, we arrived in the preceding lecture.

But it will be asked, in great surprise, Is there anything still farther? Is there anything

more depending on the sacrament of penance? Have we not yet had sufficient of these inventions and additions to God's holy Word, and the faith of the Catholic Church? No: If you would only just consider, my brethren, for a moment, the peculiar state in which mankind are described to exist in *purgatory*, you would directly see that there is an evident difficulty attending that doctrine; which, if left alone, would immediately destroy it. For thus it is: The souls of all righteous men must, according to the preceding doctrines, be found in purgatory after death. But by what means are they to be relieved from it? They have arrived at it by reason of a deficiency of works of satisfaction in this life to atone for their sins. It is clear they can do no works of satisfaction in the place whither they are gone; there can be no *prayers, alms-deeds, fasting*, or works of piety among brethren in that place*—therefore nothing remains for them but passive suffering; and if you remember how I described those sufferings, the severity of them, and the length of them,—hundreds of thousands of years,—it will be manifest that a doctrine so dreadful, so distressing to all our knowledge of the mercy and love of God, must find, somewhere or other, an alleviation. If there should be nothing invented by which the ex-

* Thus Bonaventura says: "There is no room there [Purgatory] for *deserts* or for *sacraments*."

tremity of this fearful state should be warded off, nothing to soften or mitigate its extreme malediction, the thing would be so distressing, both to ourselves in prospect, and in regard to all our relations and friends thither gone before us, that it would be absolutely intolerable. But there is this invention—the Church of Rome has found it out—she has devised a plan by which men *may* escape the extreme punishments of their state of purgatory, and satisfaction may be rendered for them even there; and that invention is—INDULGENCES. To this doctrine then of *indulgences* it will be my duty to call your attention in the present lecture; and in so doing, I shall first have to lay before you four general principles upon which this doctrine seems to be built in the theology of Rome, by help of which, I shall be able to explain and define to you more exactly what an indulgence means. I shall then endeavour to prove to you by public documents how the Church of Rome holds this doctrine, and point out instances and facts of history, in which we may see its working and effects. And thirdly, having so done, I shall make an appeal to Scripture and antiquity.

There are four principles, or as it were (to them) axioms assumed by the Church of Rome, upon which the theory of indulgences is built.

1. They assert, that in the merits of Christ there is an *overplus* of satisfaction; more satis-

faction than was needed for the sins of man. They say that one drop of Christ's blood would have been sufficient to atone for the sins of man,*—but he shed more than one drop;—therefore all the merit contained in that which was beyond the one drop, remains. And it remains not in any vague and indefinite manner without an object, but it remains *in the keeping of the Church*.

2. Secondly, they assert that by certain saints and martyrs of the Church, there have been done holy actions and works of merit, more than sufficient to compensate for *their own* venial sins, more than sufficient to pass *themselves* through the fire of purgatory; and that from this source is derived another surplus of satisfactions, which being added to those of Christ, make up a considerable stock or treasury *in the keeping of the Church*.

3. Thirdly, they assert that it is quite consistent with God's justice, to allow the surplus merits of a saint or martyr to stand (upon conditions) for the deficient works of a sinner, and that these being added to the merits of Christ, will be sufficient to obtain a diminution, or an entire remission of the pains due to God's wrath, either in this world or in purgatory.

4. Fourthly, they maintain, as a consequent from these previous assertions, that the pope, as head of the Church, has a power vested in him of

* Delahogue de Pœnitentiâ.

granting out of this treasury of merits, a certain portion at one time or a certain portion at another (upon conditions), so as to balance and make up the account of debtor and creditor between the sinner and God.

And this is called an *INDULGENCE*, *i. e.* a remission of the whole or part of the debt due to God in the case of temporal punishments, by a power granted by the pope.—And it operates in two ways: First, it may be received *prospectively*, *i. e.* in regard to every individual in his own person : and so a man, knowing that he shall be one day in purgatory, with a debt of sin about him, may obtain an indulgence beforehand from the pope, and so be happy. And secondly, it operates *retrospectively*, in regard to a vicarious work performed by one man for another ; and so charitable Christians, feeling for the pains which their relations and friends must be suffering in the fires of purgatory, and no longer able of themselves to help themselves, have a power to obtain from the pope an *indulgence* for them : and they themselves doing certain works of alms-deeds, prayers, masses and the like, do obtain thereby a commutation of the sentence of God, to a certain extent, or altogether ; according as the indulgence permits.

Such is as clear an account as I think can well be given of the meaning of *indulgences*. You perceive how it arises and of necessity grows out of

the previous doctrine of purgatory : one leads on to the other. To take away the inconsistencies and difficulties of the one, you must resort to the invention of the other, as a sort of patchwork or prop to support its weakness ; just as Bishop Taylor says :—“ *Purgatory is the mother of INDULGENCES.*” *—Had it not been for the former, you would not have been troubled with the latter ; had you not been bewildered by the difficulty of closing up the kingdom of heaven against the righteous penitent, by placing him in a *fictitious prison*, you would not have needed to resolve the difficulty by inventing a *fictitious key* to unlock that prison. But so it ever will be when we prefer our own inventions to the word of God.

Let us now proceed to unfold the particulars of this doctrine, by reference to the public teaching of the Romish Church.

We have asserted all through these lectures, that the *principle* of Romish error has been *addition*,—

* “The doctrine of purgatory is the mother of indulgences ; and the fear of *that* has introduced *these*,—for the world happened to be abused like the countryman in the fable, who being told that he was likely to fall into a delirium in his feet, was advised for remedy to take the juice of cotton. He feared a disease that was not, and looked for a cure as ridiculous.”—*Dissuasive*, chap. i. § iv.

And just in a similar way Jewel says : “ Here, Mr. Harding, you see the antiquity, authority, and best countenance of your pardons, that they flowed first out of the sinks of your purgatory, as one vanity floweth out of another.”—*Jewel*, Defence of the Apology against Harding the Jesuit, chap. vii. Dis. i. p. 486.

that Romanists do not err from an introduction of doctrines that have no shadow or foundation, but that they have taken up some sort of groundwork in a real doctrine or practice, and then have added their own peculiarities thereupon; and this principle is just as true in indulgences as in any other of their doctrines. For in the early Church there certainly was a custom of indulgences universally practised by the bishops in each diocese, just as much as there was a custom of penance; but it was public and open, and referred to the canonical discipline of the Church, and not to private sins. Those who had fallen away from the Church in times of persecution, those who had lapsed into any heresy or schism, and afterwards repenting might desire to be restored to the Church, were compelled to go through a public, and sometimes a very severe course of penance; but there was always a power vested in the bishops, if they saw that the penitent displayed true signs of contrition, to shorten or to moderate the term of penance which had been at first decreed. Thus in the Council of Nice it was determined that for the sin of idolatry, three years or ten years should be passed in a certain state of public disgrace and penance, before re-admission into full communion: but then it was added, that it was in the bishop's power to deal more mildly with the penitent, and restore him to communion sooner, if the penitent's behaviour

should seem to him to deserve it.*—And this power, vested in the bishop, and constantly exercised by him, was called “*an indulgence*.”†—It was precisely on the same ground as that of the incestuous person described in the first epistle to the Corinthians. St. Paul denounces the sin and excommunicates the offender; he exhorts the Corinthian Church to “deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord;” but yet he afterwards, in the second epistle, says,—“sufficient to such a man is this punishment inflicted of many; so that contrariwise, ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with over-much sorrow.”‡ It was evidently a relaxa-

* Conc. Nic. Can. xii.

† “It was not any pretended power of delivering souls from the pains of purgatory, by virtue of a stock of merits, or works of supererogation, which they of the Church of Rome call now the Church’s treasure, and of which the Pope is become the sole dispenser;—but anciently an indulgence was no more than that power which every bishop had of moderating the canonical punishments which, in a course of penance, were inflicted upon sinners; so that if the bishop saw any one to be a zealous and earnest penitent, he had liberty to shorten the time of his penance,—that is, grant him a relaxation of some of his penitential exercises, and admit him sooner than others to communion.—*This was the true ancient notion of an indulgence.*”—Bingham, book xviii. chap. iv. § ix. Proved from the Council of Lerida; Conc. Herden. Can. v.; and Council of Chalcedon, Can. xvi.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 5; and 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7.

tion or remission of the previous sentence of excommunication; and in that sense an *indulgence*. St. Paul, who had decreed the sentence as a matter of Church discipline, mitigated or relaxed the sentence, as a matter of Church discipline; but it had no reference to that sense of indulgence which Romanists advocate, whose object is release from purgatorial fire.

This then is one way in which we can trace a groundwork for the doctrine of indulgences; but there is also another, of a kindred character. It was always a privilege of the martyrs in times of persecution, to intercede for those who had fallen from the faith, so that they might receive a shorter time of penance before restoration to full communion. By this a practice grew up, that any one receiving the crown of martyrdom would place, in a letter addressed to the bishop, the names of many persons whom he might desire to receive, in this sense, an indulgence. This grew up, from a simple beginning, into a gross abuse, which St. Cyprian speaks of in his Treatise on the Lapsed, and also in his Epistles. What might have been harmless in the case of one or two, became an error when systematically pursued, without respect to the persons for whom the martyr might be pleading; nor could it possibly have reference to anything save the present world. Thus St. Cyprian speaks: "The martyrs direct that something should be done, but only if it be just and lawful,

and if it be nothing in disobedience to God. The martyrs direct that something should be done ; but if the things that they ask are not certified in the law of the Lord, we have first to learn that they gain of God what they ask for, and then we must do what they direct.”* This custom is alluded to as the origin of the Romanist indulgences, by their own writers of the present day.† But how far different that custom was from any notion of redeeming souls from purgatory, any one of common observation will perceive. The one, a harmless work of charity, to relax the severity of ecclesiastical discipline ;—the other, a presumptuous interference with the prerogatives of God. The one, a harmless listening to the prayers of just men dying for the sake of their Redeemer, with reference to the *present* world ; the

* Cyprian de Lapsis, 12.

† Dr. Wiseman says : “ The chief ground of indulgence or mitigation, and the one which most exactly includes all the principles of a modern indulgence, was the earliest perhaps admitted into the Church. When the martyrs, or those who were on the point of receiving the crown, and had already attested their love of Christ by suffering, were confined in prison, those unfortunate Christians who had fallen, *i. e.* had abjured Christ under heathen tortures, and were condemned to penance, had recourse to their mediation ; and upon returning to the pastors of the Church with a written recommendation to mercy from one of those chosen servants of God and witnesses of Christ, were received at once to reconciliation, and absolved from the remainder of their penance.”—*Wiseman*, Lect. xii. On Indulgences.

other, a substitution of human merits to compensate for sins, and to purchase salvation, with reference to a *future* world.

But we must now turn to the public documents of Rome ;—and in doing so, we shall find one very remarkable fact. They are altogether and cautiously silent as to any *definition* of an indulgence. Sometimes the word occurs, and sometimes the doctrine, but not the word and the doctrine together ; so that we have difficulty in fastening upon them any distinct meaning for their theory.

We find so early as the Council of Florence (A.D. 1438) some mention of what an indulgence is,—but the *word* is carefully kept out of view ; while in the Council of Trent the *word* is given, but the *doctrine* kept out of view. The Council of Florence states that “if any true penitents shall depart this life in the love of God, before that they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance for faults of commission or omission, their souls are purified after death by the pains of purgatory ; and that for their release from these pains, the suffrages of the faithful who are alive are profitable to them,—to wit, the sacrifices of masses, prayers and alms, and other works of piety, which, *according to the appointment of the Church*, are wont to be made by the faithful for other believers.” Of course, “the appointment of the Church” means *an indulgence* ;—a power granting permission that the said prayers, masses, &c. may be efficacious. Then

going on to the Council of Trent, in the twenty-first Session we find an allusion to it, calling indulgences "spiritual graces," "heavenly treasures of the Church," and so forth;—but still no exact definition. Again, in the twenty-fifth Session there is a decree expressly made, as follows: "As Christ has given to the Church the power of granting indulgences, and the Church from the earliest times has exercised this power divinely bestowed upon it, the holy synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, being extremely wholesome for Christian people, and approved by the authority of the sacred councils, be retained in the Church, and condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or deny that the Church has the power of granting them."* Here then you perceive there is no definition or explanation of what they mean by an indulgence;—it is carefully avoided. So also it is in the creed of Pope Pius IV, which immediately followed: "I affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people."† And it is just the same in the catechism of the Council, and in all the other public documents, until we come to a decree of Pope Leo X. In this it is said: "We have thought

* Conc. Trident. Session xxv. The subject is also mentioned in Session xxi. ; but in the same vague manner, not furnishing any explanation of what is meant.

† Creed of Pope Pius IV.

proper to signify to you by these presents that the Roman Church, which others are bound to follow as their mother, hath taught that the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter. . . . by virtue of the keys whose power is to open heaven, by taking away its obstructions on behalf of Christ's faithful people,—namely, the guilt and punishment due for actual sins, the guilt indeed by the sacrament of penance, but the temporal punishment due according to divine justice for actual sins by means of ecclesiastical indulgence,—we have thought proper to signify to you, that he, the bishop of Rome, is able for reasonable causes to grant to the faithful in Christ INDULGENCES, *either in this life or in purgatory, out of the superabundant merits of Christ and his Saints.*"

Here then we have a tangible, definite notion of what they mean by an indulgence, even as I explained it at the commencement of this lecture. It is all abundantly verified and confirmed in subsequent writers and divines of that communion; for instance, Maimbourg, in the *History of Lutheranism*, says thus: "The bishops of the earliest ages gave peace to apostates, and reconciled them to the Church, by abridging the time of their criminal penance through the intercession of martyrs, and in virtue of their sufferings, joined to those of the Saviour of the world."* True, they did so, as explained above; but not in reference

* Maimbourg, *Histoire de Luthéranisme*, vol. i.

to a redemption from purgatory. The martyrs did intercede, but their merits were not added "to the merits of the Saviour of the world," to purchase anything *after this world*. Herein lies the distinction. But we have abundance of farther evidence from P. Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Bouvier, and others, sufficiently explaining this; but passing them for the present, let us at once come to more modern times. The doctrine is given in Dr. Butler's Catechism thus : " Q. Will the penance enjoined in confession always satisfy for sins?—A. No; but whatever else is wanting may be supplied by *indulgences*, and our own penitential endeavours."* And the same again, in a still more recent author : " An indulgence is a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, of a portion or the entire of the temporal punishment due to sin. The infinite merits of Christ form the fund from whence this remission is derived; but besides, the Church holds that by the communion of saints, penitential works performed by the just, beyond what their sins might exact, are available to other members of Christ's mystical body."*

From all this, we have sufficient testimony out of their own mouths as to what is meant by *Indulgences*. Let us now go on to the practical working of this doctrine. The indulgences are

* Butler's Catechism,—the usual authoritative catechism approved by the Romanist bishops in Ireland.

† Wiseman, Lectures, ii. 71.

issued by the Pope. They either apply to the full term of years that is required for remission of penal suffering,—in which case they are called *plenary*,—or they apply to a definite number of days or years, according to the works of satisfaction that are to be done in commutation for them. Thus, we find that persons visiting the sick and doing certain deeds of alms, saying prayers with beads a certain number of times, hearing mass on certain saints' days, and praying for the propagation of the faith,—will secure an indulgence for one hundred days or two hundred days in purgatory. But more particularly it is applied to any special good work, either in temporal or religious things,—as, for instance, crusades against the heretics,—building, or contributing to build, bridges, churches, monasteries, nunneries, and the like. Pope Urban II (A.D. 1095) granted a plenary indulgence to the crusaders in the Holy War. “Whosoever for devotion's sake, and not for honour or money, shall go to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God,—that journey shall be counted instead of all his penance;”^{*}—and we know that the expenses of the Crusade, as well in men as arms—captains and soldiers—were all furnished with an enthusiasm that almost amounted to fanaticism, by the hopes held out to the credulous of these indulgences in purgatory. In the same way, many of those noble temples which are

^{*} Concil. Claromont. ii. p. 829.

confessed to be the great ornaments both of our country and of others, especially St. Peter's at Rome, trace their origin to a similar source ; and the foundation of many religious houses, and vast endowments in land, and privileges granted to the Church in every quarter of the world, may be referred to a superstitious dread of purgatory, alleviated by the hopes held out of indulgence for value received.

Again, the same doctrine was applied to particular churches and altars, which were thereby entitled "*privileged*." The Pope granted a dispensation to some one church, or some one altar ; and all who went thither to say their prayers, or to hear mass, received an indulgence of a certain stipulated number of years. For instance, Boniface VIII granted to all those who should visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul a plenary indulgence from all their sins.* In the church of Santa Maria de Popolo, there are, for every day in the year, two thousand eight hundred years of pardon ; which are confirmed by the popes Pascal I, Boniface VIII, and Gregory IX. In the church of SS. Vitus and Modestus, for every day in the year, seven thousand years. At the sepulchre of Christ in Venice, there is hung up a prayer of St. Austin, with an indulgence of fourscore and two thousand years, granted by Boniface VIII.† And frequently

* Bullar. Compend. Cherubin. *Rom.* 1623, I. i. p. 36.

† See Bishop Taylor's *Dissuasive*, Works, vol. x. p. 195.

these privileges extended to redeeming a soul from purgatory, by a sort of vicarious atonement, and particular altars had inscriptions over them, stating this to the people: "*Here a soul is delivered from purgatory at every mass.*"*—Sometimes again, these indulgences took a different turn, and were granted to what was called a "Confraternity." A confraternity was an association of brethren for religious purposes; and in order to encourage such associations, the pope would grant to all who should belong to them, an indulgence. Thus you will find the "*Confraternity of the Rosary*," *i. e.* an association established for the purpose of repeating the rosary in honour of the Virgin Mary,—and the "*Confraternity of the Scapular*." The scapular was a piece of cloth taken from the gowns of the Carmelite monks, to which certain privileges were attached; and it was promised by the pope, that all who should wear this cloth in honour of the Virgin, repeat certain prayers, or say the Ave Maria a certain number of times, should have an indulgence.†

So again, with a little variation, but with the same spirit, you will find particular acts of worship, specially to the saints, upheld by similar

* Thiers, *Traité des Superstitions*, liv. vii. chap. xviii., as cited by Palmer in his *Letters to Wiseman*, No. 7.

† This may be found as the doctrine of Rome even so late as the year 1838. See a *Treatise on the Scapular*, *Dublin*, 1838, p. 50.

grants ;—acts of worship paid to the *HEARTS of Jesus and Mary*,—praying before a crucifix,—repetition of hymns in honour of the Eucharist,—kneeling at the elevation of the host,—using certain rosaries and beads,—repeating the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria in honour of the "*five wounds of our Lord*,"—possessing chaplets dedicated to the Virgin,—and blessed crosses,—and medals ;—and in fact, a thousand other similar superstitions :—all these things you will find extended to an infinite degree in various authors and under various popes, as furnishing indulgences in purgatory.*

* Various bulls affirming this may be found in Mr. Perceval's valuable work on the Roman Schism.

† It would be endless to endeavour to set before the reader the various minutiae into which this doctrine has been carried. Those who are curious to learn more on this head, may refer to Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, Du Pin, Maimbourg, Sechen-dorff, *Lettres sur les Jubilés* par M. Clais, 1751, &c. &c.

While this sheet is about to go the printer, I read an account of a fresh "*Confraternity*" established at Dublin, called "*The Altar Confraternity of the Parish of St. Andrew, Westland Row*." It is said that "A plenary indulgence is granted by the Sovereign Pontiff Gregory XVI on the second and fourth Sunday in every month, to all the members of this confraternity who shall worthily confess and receive. He also grants a plenary indulgence to each of the members of this confraternity at the hour of death. These indulgences are calculated to *diminish the punishment due to sin, after the guilt has been blotted out in the sacrament of penance* ;—they are consequently most useful towards shortening and mitigating the scorching fire of purgatory." This is a remarkable instance, that even to this day

But still farther. All that we have said as yet is nothing to that which still remains. The doctrines and practices above stated are indeed debasing enough, but you will soon agree with me in saying that they are nothing in comparison with that which follows. The indulgences above described were made by several of the popes, objects of sale and traffic. It became a practice for money to be paid for them, as a matter of merchandize between the clergy and the laity. It is true, and we are bound to acknowledge that the practice of the sale of indulgences is repudiated by all good Romanists. Cheerfully and gladly would we pay tribute to the many good and religious men among them, at all times of the Church, who have denounced this custom as well as many other customs ; but still it is a point of our duty to show that such things are a part of their *system*,—that they are historical facts,—that these things have been done by several of their popes, (for whom be it remembered they claim infallibility), and therefore must fairly be attributed to their Church as part of their religious system. While we grieve for them as mistaken, and pray for them as believing in that which is contrary to God's word, still it behoves us not to spare, out

Rome has not changed. The document purporting to confer the indulgence is signed "W. M., P.P." ; and a farther account of it may be found in the "Church Intelligencer," Wednesday, March 23, 1842, taken from the "Dublin Morning Press."

of any false charity, the confessed errors of their general system of religion.

I said that these indulgences were made matters of sale. Originally the indulgence was to be obtained by certain pious actions—alms-deeds were of course to be considered among pious actions—so that the process of receiving money for an indulgence under the name of an alms-deed was natural. But what so easy as to go on a little farther, and substitute, under the pretext of an alms-deed, some payment of actual money to the clergy, the bishops, or the pope,—though no definite work of charity was ever contemplated. This took place, and the practice grew up from one thing to another, until it assumed the most gross and undisguised character of a regular traffic. This we know from the history of several of the popes, and more particularly at that period of history immediately preceding the Reformation in Germany. Thus, for instance, we find Pope Alexander VI, A. D. 1500, granting a plenary indulgence in words to the following effect :—“ that all who are contrite and confessed were *to put into the chest such a sum of money, gold or silver*,”—and the sum was regulated by a scale of prices, which bore reference to the different crimes of which men might be guilty. This scale of prices we find in a book called “ The Tax Book of the Apostolic Chancery,”* and in this book every crime is

* This book has been rejected, and is called spurious by the

set down at its price. Going on a few years farther, we come to Leo X, with whose history all who have given any attention to the great struggles of the Reformation will be well acquainted. This pope employed a Dominican monk called Tetzel, who went about publicly and openly offering indulgences for sale. The purchase had now no longer reference to remission of penance, but it was supposed to have a prospective as well as retrospective effect, and people might buy either for themselves, or for their relations, any number of years' redemption from purgatory, at a well known fixed and regulated price. There was no scruple about this—it was not hid. To such judicial blindness were men led, that Tetzel went about openly proclaiming, that he “had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching;” and the inferior officers concerned in this traffic were daily seen in taverns and other public places of resort indulging in every sort of riot and debauchery, yet proclaiming for sale “this power of the keys.”* Fearful indeed was this prostitution of all true religion,—fearful this denial of our Lord Jesus Christ—for that certainly was a denial of Him, which went about thus shamelessly to substitute a pecuniary bargain for the merits of his

Romanists; but there is very good evidence that it is genuine, nevertheless; but, at any rate, the facts are indisputable.

* See Maimbourg, and Mosheim's *Eccles. History*.

death. I shall say no more upon this subject, but leave it to you, my brethren, to imagine what the darkness of the human mind must have been at that day, when such things could have taken place under the direction of the Church. I shall merely add the words of Bishop Taylor, who thus describes it ;—"It is a practice," says that Bishop, "that hath turned penances into a fair, and the court of conscience into a lombard, and the labours of love into the labours of pilgrimages and superstitious and useless wanderings from place to place, and religion into vanity, and our hope in God to a confidence in man, and our fears of hell to a mere scarecrow to rich and confident sinners."

But we must now proceed to set before you the proofs which Scripture and antiquity supply against this doctrine of indulgences,—in order to show you how correct and justified the Church Catholic in England is in rejecting this schismatic innovation.

Indeed it would be almost superfluous to do this. The common reason of an ordinarily intelligent man would in itself pronounce against it ; and the very gross abuses and perversions of it which I have just detailed, I presume not even a Romanist himself of the present day could defend. But the *doctrine* they do defend, and therefore, to show the doctrine wrong, we must have recourse to our Bibles and to our Fathers of the Church.

Now our Bibles tell us this,—that the great and only source of any remission of the penalty due to sin is in God,—that the only means of our receiving this remission is in Christ Jesus—He having shed his blood by one great sacrifice upon the cross. We need not repeat the arguments which were used in considering the doctrine of satisfactions and of purgatory—all those arguments and all the texts there deduced will apply to this question also—for if we show *satisfactions* to be wrong, and if we show *purgatory* to be wrong, it of course follows that any doctrine based upon their foundation must be wrong also. If it be proved by Scripture contrary to the truth that any man on earth can make a satisfaction to God for his sins by any meritorious actions of his own,—much more is it contrary to the truth, that there can exist anywhere in man a power to indulge, or remit any portion of the satisfaction said to be due.

Let the reader then refer to Lectures VIII and IX for the *Scripture* refutations of this doctrine ; and so let us turn at once to the Fathers of the Church. And what do we find here ? First, a total silence on any such subject, even by way of possibility, for many hundreds of years, in all the principal writers. Neither Saints Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, or Austin, say one word upon the subject, —as testified by Durandus ; and the last of these writers flourished towards the close of the fourth century. And even still later, neither in the

writings of Gregory, nor Anselm, nor St. Bernard, is there any notice taken of it; but it was a doctrine wholly unknown for about twelve hundred years after Christ.

But we are not to expect, from the nature of things, any express testimony against an error, which never was imagined to exist.* Many, however, of the fathers speak *unconsciously* against it, when they are illustrating points of Christian doctrine, and may seem to hint at certain abuses in the Church which seemed to have a tendency towards it; as for instance, St. Cyprian, speaking of the lapsed Christians, says thus: "Men cannot be greater than God. It is not for the servant to yield his grace and indulgence, when the offence is in main weight against the Lord."—"Shall a man suppose that any one in opposition to the judge, can hope to avail for the universal remission and condonation of offences, or shelter others when he has not gained his own vindication."† And St. Chrysostom, speaking of

* "But as to the thing itself: it is so wholly new, so merely devised and forged by themselves, so newly created out of nothing, from great mistakes of Scripture and dreams of shadows from antiquity,—that we are to admonish our charges that they cannot reasonably expect many sayings of the primitive doctors against them, any more than against the new fancies of the Quakers, which were born but yesterday. That which is not, cannot be numbered; and that which was not, could not be confuted."—*Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive, Works, vol. x. p. 141.*

† Cyprian de Lapsis, 12.

pilgrimages : “ To gain pardon for our crimes, it is not right to spend money, or to do anything of this sort ; there is no need of journeying to distant places, nor of going to remote nations.”* In the same way, St. Bernard : “ It is not necessary for thee to pass over the sea, to penetrate the clouds to go beyond the Alps ; there is, I say, no great journey proposed to you. Meet God within yourself, for the word is nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart.”† And St. Austin says : “ He did not say, ‘ go to the east and seek for righteousness ; sail to the west, that you may receive indulgence.’ Forgive your enemy, and it shall be forgiven you. Be indulgent to him, and indulgence shall be shown you. Give, and it shall be given you. He seeks nothing of you externally to yourself. God directs you to yourself and your conscience ; He has placed *within you* that which he requires.”‡ And altogether the whole testimony of their writings, speaking of repentance, speaking of absolution, speaking of the ancient penances, speaking of the ancient relaxations of penance by the bishop,—in all these places their language is such as to point, clearly and satisfactorily, to the one great remission of sins in Christ, and no other. No pilgrimages, or privileged altars, or privileged fraternities, or privileged rosaries or beads, or masses, or prayers,

* 1 Homil. in Philom.

† Sermon. i. de Advent.

‡ Augustin. tom. x. p. 277 ; De Martyr. Sermon. iii.

or any such-like thing do we ever find mentioned, when opportunity might have been to speak of them, if they had been truths of the Catholic Church. No, even their own writers assent and agree to this undoubted fact. Morinus agrees that the indulgences of Rome were never known till the twelfth century. Polydore Virgil says, that the use of indulgences is no older than the time of Gregory the Great, and for this his work was placed in the list of prohibited books.* Alphonsus de Castro also says: "There is nothing that the Scriptures have less opened, or whereof the old fathers have less written, than of pardons. Of pardons, in the Scriptures, and doctors, *there is no mention.*"† And Bishop Fisher, more at length, while he *defends the practice of indulgences*, yet is compelled to confess that they were only *modern inventions*. "It has caused, perhaps, many persons not to trust in those indulgences, because their use in the Church seems to be rather modern, and very lately found out; to whom I answer, that it does not certainly appear from whom they were first delivered. . . . No orthodox person doubts whether there be a purgatory, about which among the ancients no mention was made, or very rarely, and by the Greeks up to this day it is not believed that there is a purgatory. As long as there was no thought about purgatory, no one thought of

* Index Libr. Prohibit. p. 853.

† Alphons. de Castro, lib. viii. de Indulgentiis.

indulgences, for all opinion about indulgences depends upon that. If you take away purgatory, what need will there be for indulgences? Indulgences therefore began when people began to tremble at the torments of purgatory.”* A most strange admission. We *do* take away purgatory, and therefore we take away indulgences.

We take away purgatory, because it is contrary to the attributes of God in his justice and in his mercy,—because it undermines all true morality, and is an incentive to human beings to despair of that final happiness which is promised them in the kingdom of heaven,—and we take away indulgences, because in a kindred manner they are against all that we have ever heard and read and feel of the attributes of an all-wise and all-powerful God, a merciful and compassionate Saviour.

We take away indulgences because we have reason to think there can be nothing so well devised by the skilfulness of our mortal enemy to rob sin of all its horror and atrocity, and to hide the wrath of God under a cloud of human substitutions, to make that way broad—the way to heaven—which God made narrow; and that gate strait—the gate of hell—which God made broad.

We take away indulgences, because we cannot imagine anything of so fatal and direct a tendency to bring about in men a loose, careless, profligate, abandoned life, teaching them either to postpone

* Assertion. Luther. Confut. *Antwerp*. 1523, p. 111.

repentance or neglect it altogether ; teaching them that they may go on for years and years in sin, heedless and abandoned, because that at any time for the sake of a few alms deeds, or by the giving of a few pounds of silver or of gold, they have it in their own power at any moment to restore themselves to the favour of the Church and of God, irrespective of the internal repentance of a contrite spirit and an amended life.

We take away indulgences, because they have respect to a vicarious payment of one man for the sins of another, as they who pay money for the masses of the priesthood in behalf of their deceased relations, by which they imagine that they obtain a certain number of years release from purgatory, whereas God has told us in his written word, that there is only one vicarious suffering and one vicarious payment for the sins of the world, and that is the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin.

We take away indulgences, because they have a tendency to substitute external, formal, trivial acts of bodily devotion, for the true inward and spiritual feelings of the religion of Christ ; as, for instance, in pilgrimages to shrines and altars, in privileged rosaries, beads, and crosses, or in prayers repeated by the number, and computed in value by the quantity instead of by the inward supplication of a deep and contrite spirit.

We take away indulgences, because they teach men to invent all sorts of mediators

between themselves and God, in addition to the “one only mediator between God and man, the man, Christ Jesus;” bringing them before saints and angels, and introducing them to imaginary objects of worship, as “the *heart* of Jesus and Mary,” the five wounds, the rosary, the crucifix, and the like, and so substituting these intermediate objects of prayer, and rendering the tone of their religion, if not actually wicked and idolatrous, at any rate, weak, frivolous, and superstitious.

And lastly, *we take away indulgences*, because they rob God of the honour due unto His Name.—“Seeing that in Him we live, and move, and have our being,”—seeing that He must be the sole awarder of His own grace, the sole dispenser of His own promises, and the sole judge of the right time and the right manner in which He may relax or remit His own decrees of punishment,—and that whatever power or authority He may in His omniscient wisdom have given to his ministers in Christ, to declare and pronounce remission of sin and indulgence from their guilt,—still He never could by any possibility have delivered to them a power, which should, on the prices of a human calculation either of good works or of silver and gold, purchase or offer to be purchased, against His own knowledge and against His own power, redemption from that sinfulness for which Jesus came into the world to die. So that this is the sum of all;—according to our twenty-second

Article.—Both purgatory and pardons, *i. e.* indulgences, are “a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture; but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

I shall conclude all by simply quoting to you a very remarkable passage from the Book of Homilies: it is in the third part of the sermon on good works.

“Sects and feigned religions were neither the fortieth part so many among the Jews, nor more superstitiously and ungodlily abused, than of late days among us. Which sects and religions had so many hypocritical and feigned words in their state of religion (as they arrogantly name it), that their lamps (as they said) ran always over; able to satisfy not only for their own sins, but also for all other, their benefactors, brothers and sisters of religion, as most ungodly and craftily they had persuaded the multitude of ignorant people, keeping in divers places (as it were) marts or markets of merits, being full of their holy relics, images, shrines, and works of overflowing abundance, ready to be sold, and all things which they had were called holy; holy cowls, holy girdles, holy pardons, beads, holy shoes, holy rules, and all full of holiness.

“And briefly to pass over the ungodly and counterfeit religion, let us rehearse some other kinds of papistical superstitions and abuses; as of beads, Lady Psalters, and Rosaries, of fifteen Oes,

of St. Bernard's verses, of St. Agatha's letters, of purgatory, of masses satisfactory, of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics and of hallowed beads, bells, bread, water, psalms, candles, fire, and such other; of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons and such-like merchandise; which were so esteemed and abused, to the great prejudice of God's glory and Commandments, that they were made most high and most holy things whereby to attain to the everlasting life, or remission of sin. Yea also vain inventions, unfruitful ceremonies, ungodly laws, decrees, and counsels of Rome."

SERMON XI.

HEBREWS IX. 25, 26.

“Nor yet that he should offer himself OFTEN, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must He OFTEN have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself.”

ACCORDING to the arrangement which was proposed—to consider in order the seven sacraments of Rome, and as each of them should be brought before us, to dwell on those distinctive errors by which the Romish Church has separated herself from the Catholic Church of Christ—it will be my duty in the present lecture, to set before you the HOLY EUCHARIST, or, as we generally describe it in our Church—*The Supper of the Lord*.

As to the *sacramental* character of the eucharist, there will be no difficulty. In all its points and bearings it fulfils the definition, both of our own Church and of Rome. It is a federal act,—it has form and matter,—it was instituted by Christ,—

it is a means of grace, conveying to us by a mystery a union and fellowship with Christ, as "the head of the body, the Church." All these points of definition are agreed upon; they are common ground, upon which though we may differ from many peculiarities of dissent, yet with Rome we are at peace and harmony.

But there *are* points in this holy sacrament upon which there is no harmony between us. Notwithstanding our agreement in the *definition*, there are, both in the doctrines which flow out of it, and the practices by which it is conducted, many vital—most vital points—in which Rome is distinguished from the Catholic Church. To these we shall have to advert, classifying them under the three following divisions. I. The sacrifice of the mass. II. The doctrine of transubstantiation. III. Communion in one kind. The first of these subjects will form our present lecture.

To those who have been accustomed to a low and sectarian view of this holy rite—who have been accustomed to consider it as a mere token or symbol of Christian fellowship, or at most a useful religious ceremony reminding us of the death of Christ—to such it would no doubt appear a startling thing to say, that even in the doctrine of a sacrifice as somewhat contained in the holy eucharist, the two Churches of Rome and England retain a considerable agreement. But however startling it may appear at first sight, it will

only require a candid and impartial consideration of the subject in the manner in which it shall now be placed before them, to see how far this agreement may be carried, and in what sense. I shall endeavour to set this out before you, as the first branch of our present enquiry, pointing out the opinions of the primitive Church thereupon, and illustrating them by our own formularies and standard divines : and thus having explained to you the exact sense in which we denominate the holy sacrament of the eucharist a sacrifice, and having led you to the highest point in which this agreement rests ; then explain to you how much *higher* the Church of Rome advances, and while our notion of the sacrificial character of the Lord's supper is harmless and innocent, and is but the right following of the word of God, her notion is altogether, according to the words of our 31st Article, " a blasphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit."

In the ancient Church, the word *sacrifice* was applied to all the different parts of divine worship,—not confined to the communion service, but applied to the prayers and praises of the whole course. Thus Eusebius speaks of the prayers of the Christians, as " rational sacrifices offered to God without blood ;"* and Clemens Alexandrinus says—"the sacrifices of Christians are their prayers

* Eusebius de Laud. Constant. Orat. p. 659.

and praises, and reading of the Scriptures, and psalms, and hymns.”* And sometimes it is applied to almsgiving, accompanied with prayer,—as St. Hilary, commenting on the words of David, “Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice,” says thus: “The sacrifice of Christians is their prayers, recommended to God by stretching forth their hands to relieve the poor. For we, upon whom the ends of the world have come, do not sacrifice to God with blood or burnt offerings. The evening sacrifice which is pleasing to God, is that which Christ teaches us in his Gospel:—‘I was an hungered and ye fed me, thirsty and ye gave me drink, naked and ye clothed me.’”† So that the word sacrifice, as applied to Christian worship and Christian usages, is a correct word; and if we wanted farther corroboration of it, we should find it in Scripture, where St. Paul tells the Hebrews—“by Him let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name.”

But more especially the notion of a sacrifice was applied by the ancient Church to that portion of their divine worship, which was embraced under the *holy eucharist*. By Clement of Rome, so early as the year 96, we find it called “*an oblation* :” and he speaks of those,—the minis-

* Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 860. † Hilar. in Ps. cxl. p. 330.

ters of God,—who “offer the gifts.”* By Irenæus in like manner,† and by Justin Martyr.‡ But farther than a mere oblation or offering, the word *sacrifice* is distinctly given by Irenæus, as the common name by which it was known. “Therefore the oblation of the Church, which the Lord hath taught to be offered in the whole world, is esteemed by God a pure sacrifice.”§ And Justin Martyr: || “We offer unto God in every place among the Gentiles, sacrifices pleasing to Him, and pure.” And in the Apostolical Constitutions in like manner:—“Instead of bloody sacrifices, Christ enjoined the rational and unbloody sacrifice of his body and blood; for where is Christ’s blood sacrificed in an unbloody way, but in the eucharistical chalice?”¶ So in the Liturgy of St. James it is called “The tremendous and unbloody sacrifice;” and in St. Chrysostom—“The reasonable and unbloody sacrifice.” Language such as this runs through all the writers of the early ages as far down as the fifth century,—all speaking of the eucharist, and of the things said and done in that holy service, as containing a sacrificial character.

* Προσφορά. Clem. Rom. Epist. c. xl. et xlv.

† Irenæus, lib. iv. c. xvii. p. 249, ed. Benedict.

‡ Justin Dial. p. 119.

§ Θυσια. Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. xxxiv. 18, &c.

|| Justin Martyr. Dial. p. 344. See also Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. xviii.; Tertullian de Orat. cap. xiv. p. 135; and Cyprian de Op. et Eleemos. p. 242.

¶ Apost. Constitut. p. 20.

But we must not be carried away by the testimony of the ancient writers, however strong it may be in itself: we must look to Scripture also, and there endeavour to ascertain if there be any grounds upon which this description rests. Is there anything in the holy Scriptures which would authorise the early fathers of the Church to use this title for the holy supper of the Lord? I think we may fairly say that there is every thing in its favour. The remarkable way and time when the institution was founded; the peculiar legal ceremony to which it had respect; the words of commemoration used by our Lord in his charge to the apostles,—all these would bear them out in their notion, and confirm the general tradition which preserved this doctrine among them. The time at which the institution was founded would certainly do so; for it was at the feast of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, that the feast of the Lord's supper was first commanded,—and Christ himself being the anti-type of that paschal lamb, and especially desiring this feast of the new covenant, to be handed down to his Church for succeeding generations, in the place of the old covenant,—it would be inferred as his wish, that in whatever light the former was considered by the Jews, the latter should be considered by Christians. Now we know that the passover was a sacrifice; the lamb was brought without blemish and without spot, the lamb was slain, the blood was sprinkled

on the door-posts, the lamb was eaten as a feast by the family, and the federal and sacramental act thus entered upon by them, was confirmed by God in the salvation of the family from the destroying angel. But Jesus Christ was the lamb pointed out in that type; Jesus Christ took up that type, fulfilled it, and then said:—"As in the ages before me, the Israelites have been shewing forth to the world my sacrifice, by a peculiar sacrifice of God's appointment in the paschal lamb,* so I will, and desire my faithful followers in the ages that are to come after me, to record and keep in memory my sacrifice, by something of a similar import. And since they ate and drank as

* Thus Bishop Andrewes says: "This is it in the eucharist that answereth to the sacrifice in the passover,—the memorial to the figure. To them it was: 'Do this in *prefiguration* of me.' To us it is: 'Do this in *commemoration* of me.' To them *foreshewing*, to us shewing forth. By the same rule that theirs was, by the same way ours is termed a *sacrifice*;—in rigour of speech, neither of them. For (to speak after the exact manner of divinity) there is but one only sacrifice, properly so called,—that is, Christ's death; and that sacrifice but once actually performed, at his death. But ever before represented in figure from the beginning, and ever since repeated in memory to the world's end,—that only absolute, all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it.....So it was the will of God that there might be with them [the Jews] a continual *foreshewing*, and with us a continual *shewing forth*, of the Lord's death till he come; and hence it is that what name theirs carried, ours do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple at it, nor need we."—*Bishop Andrewes*, Seventh Sermon, on the Resurrection.

at a sacrificial feast, so I would have my disciples do the like." And all would be confirmed and sealed to them as a religious truth, by the words of St. Paul: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast:" and in another place,—“For by this ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come.”

And certainly again, the words of institution would bear them out,—“*Do* this in remembrance of me,” where the Greek word might equally be translated—“*Offer* this in remembrance of me.” Many learned treatises have been written, wherein it is proved that the Greek word for “*do*”* or “*offer*,” bears a sacrificial sense. St. Austin defines a *sacrifice* to be—“A work *done* to keep our league of amity with God, referred to him as our sove-

* Bishop Hickee brings forward many proofs and illustrations to shew this. “In the Old Testament, ποιεῖν signifies the same as ἱεροποιεῖν, to ‘offer’ or to ‘sacrifice,’ as in Exod. xxix. 36 : “το μυσχάριον ποιήσεις.” He cites many passages from the Fathers, showing their acknowledgment of this sense ; so that he would paraphrase the words of institution thus : “Take, eat, this is my body. Make a *sacrificial service* in this way, in remembrance of me.” Johnson, and many other writers, also dwell upon the word with a similar observation. See also Parkhurst’s Greek Lexicon, at the seventh meaning of the word ποιεῖν. And therefore, exactly as we might expect, we find the ancient liturgies without exception using words of a kindred signification with sacrifice ; as, for instance, προσφορά, offering ; θυσία, sacrifice ; θυσιαστηρίον, altar of sacrifice ; αναμνημένοι προσφέρομεν, calling to remembrance, *we offer* ; προκείμενα δῶρα, gifts lying before thee, &c. &c.

reign good.”* Here, then, was a *work done* and a *league of amity* preserved, and its *reference* the glory of God: but we should add something to this definition, and say,—it must be a work done with an object of propitiation. And we know that propitiation was the peculiar mark of the institution of the Eucharist,—not that *itself* was the propitiation, but the thing of which it spoke in record, namely, the death of Christ. It was something *done*—something *offered*—and something which in the offering or doing had the propitiation, and thereby the glory of God in contemplation. And thus the fathers would have been led justly to speak of it as a sacrifice.

But again, there are other words which might have led them to see in it a sacrificial character—“*In remembrance of me,*” or rather, “*in memorial of me.*” Here the Greek word, ἀνάμνησις, is strictly of a sacrificial character. It is the very word used in the Septuagint translation in describing the offerings of the Levitical law. It is there said, that the priest “shall burn the *memorial* of it upon the altar.” It was the shew-bread offered to God in sacrifice.

Still again, there is another expression in the words of institution of like import—“This is My Body *given* for you;”—“*διδόμενον.*” Why *given*, and *to whom* given? given in propitiation as a

* Augustin de Civitate Dei, lib. x. cap. vi.

sacrifice to God. Christ said this before His actual body was given: if then He said this before the time when it was true, and the Church has ever held these words of institution as necessary for the performance of the Sacrament after the time when it was fulfilled, would not this have led the early Christian to maintain the notion of a sacrificial character attached thereto? It is said by Scripture, when it is desired to represent the sacrificial character of Christ's death, that "He *gave* himself for our sins;"* that "God so loved the world that He *gave* his only-begotten Son."† And Jesus himself in allusion to this mystery says, "The bread I will give in my flesh which I will *give* for the life of the world."‡ Now when we find this very word used in the institution "This is my body which is *given* for you," must it not have been remarked and understood in some sacrificial sense? Add also the other portion of the sacrament—the blood "*poured out*:" add also the fact of the peculiar words *body* and *blood*—not "this is bread," or "this is wine," as a mere sign or representation, and that only,—but "This is my *body*," calling their minds to the prophecy, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me." "This is my *blood*," calling their minds to the sacrificial law, "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." Add, I say,

* Gal. i. 4.

† John iii. 16.

‡ John vi. 51.

all these considerations together, and remembering that though the English words, as generally represented to us now, might be passed over as conveying no particular meaning; yet the Greek words, to the minds of the Christians of that day, with all their attention kept alive by the peculiarity of their position, would be pregnant with a spiritual interpretation, would associate readily with their Jewish notions and habits of a sacrificial offering, and so readily account for that universal doctrine which I have explained as existing throughout the Primitive Church.

But now we must come to the question of our own Church: Does the Church of England hold the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharistic feast even as the primitive Church did? Were she not to do so, she would be in a very difficult position in her controversy with Rome. Could Rome bring forward any one doctrine that was Catholic; *i. e.* universally believed,—by all men, and at all times, and in every place of the Church in her first ages, and show that we, as one particular country, had cast it off, we should be very hard pressed in the maintenance of our position as a branch of the universal Church of Christ.

But it is not so. For this let us now look at the course of our own Communion Service, and examine whether or no there be contained in it, and taught by it, this doctrine of a sacrifice; even as the early Church held it. First, then, let us con-

sider the use of the word "*Priest*" in all those portions of the Communion Service which have relation to the actual celebration. In all the other parts of the Prayer Book, "minister" and "priest" are used indiscriminately; but with one or two exceptions, for which there is a reason, you will find the word "priest" always used in the liturgy of the Eucharist.* A deacon has not the authority

* "The Greek and Latin words which we translate '*priest*,' are derived from words which signify holy [*sacerdos*, *ἱερεὺς*]; and so the word priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function is about holy things, and therefore seems to be a most proper word for him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministration of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies *him that offers up a sacrifice*, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel who hath no sacrifice to offer;—it is answered, that the ministers of the Gospel *have sacrifices to offer*. 1 St. Peter ii. 5: 'Ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifice' of prayer, praises, and thanksgiving. In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may be safely, in a metaphorical sense, called *priests*, and in a more eminent manner than other Christians are, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called,—the commemorative sacrifice of the death of Christ; and in respect of this sacrifice of the eucharist, the ancients have usually called those that offer it up '*priests*.' And if Melchisedec were called a priest, as he is often by St. Paul to the Hebrews, who had yet no other offering or sacrifice that we read of but that of bread

given to him of consecrating the holy elements : it is confined solely to the priesthood. Here then we have the first intimation of something like a sacrificial character attaching to this office. Next consider the fact of certain offerings and oblations made by the Communicants, and this expressly called an "*Offertory*." The Rubric thus directs—"Then shall the priest return to the Lord's Table; and begin *the Offertory*. For why is it an *offertory*, except it be after the custom of a sacrifice, something *offered to God*? Consider also some of the sentences which are read during that offertory: "Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things live of the *sacrifice*? and they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?" Then consider the Rubric which directs the priest himself (other persons are not to do it), but the priest himself in the presence of the people; first *to place humbly on the Holy Table* their alms, which have been offered: and secondly, the elements of the holy feast—*bread and wine*: and this typical action immediately followed by the prayer, "We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our alms and *oblations*." Then following

and wine (Gen. xiv. 18).....why may not they whose office is to bless the people as Melchisedec did, and besides that to offer holy bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ, of which *his* (Melchisedec's) at most was but a type, be as truly and without offence called '*priest*' also."—*Bishop Sparrow*, Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 337.

the service, you find these words in one of the prayers, after the reception of the holy elements ; “ We beseech Thee to accept this our *sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving.” And again, “ Although we be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept *this* [this *sacrifice*] our bounden duty and service.” All these things put together, will abundantly show our agreement with the spirit of the early Churches. We have three sorts of sacrifice. 1. A *real* sacrifice in the offering of our alms and oblations. 2. A *spiritual* sacrifice in the prayers and thanksgivings which we offer unto God in that holy service. And 3. A *commemorative* sacrifice in the offering of the bread and wine, and the eating and drinking the bread and wine when consecrated and made unto us by faith, the body and blood of our Redeemer. And this view of our liturgy is abundantly confirmed, by all the great divines of our Church who have written on the subject. From the very first moment of the reformation, down to the present day, this doctrine has never been lost sight of. Lower notions of the Eucharistic service have indeed prevailed among the Dissenters, who call the whole service an action done to record the death of Christ, or a sign of love between Christian brethren, or a token of their profession, and the like ; but in the *Church* you will find, everywhere and at all times, her testimony to this important doctrine. For

instance : Bishop *Jewell* says, “ We have the sacrifice of prayer, the sacrifice of alms-deeds, the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of thanksgiving, *the sacrifice of the death of Christ.*”* “ Certainly our sacrifice is the very body of Christ, and that for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec ; evermore standing in God’s presence, and evermore obtaining pardon for us ; not offered up by us, but offering us up unto God the Father.”† Bishop *Bilson* says : “ Besides the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, besides the dedication of our souls and bodies to be a reasonable quick and holy sacrifice to serve and please God, besides the contributions and alms there given in the primitive Church, for the relief of the poor and other good uses, a sacrifice no doubt acceptable to God,—I say, besides these three sundry sorts of offering incident to the Lord’s table, the very supper itself is a public memorial of the great and dreadful sacrifice ; I mean the death and blood-shedding of our Saviour.”‡ So Bishop *Andrewes* : “ Many among us fancy only a sacrament in this action, and look strange at the mention of a sacrifice, whereas we not only use it as a nourishment spiritual, but a means also to renew our covenant with God, by virtue of that sacrifice. And the old writers use no less the word “ *sacrifice* ” than

* Bishop *Jewell*, Defence of the Apology.

† Id. Reply unto Mr. *Harding’s* Answer.

‡ Bishop *Bilson*. Of Subjection and Rebellion.

sacrament, "*altar*" than table, "*offer*" than "eat," but both indifferently to show there is both.* And *Heylyn*, "Now such a sacrifice as this, with all the several kinds and adjuncts of it, we find asserted and maintained by the Church of England. Though it condemns the sacrifices of the masses in which it is commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, and causeth transubstantiation, as repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and destructive of the true nature of a sacrament, and to have given occasion to much superstition; yet if a true and proper sacrifice be† defined to be, *the offering of a creature* to Almighty God, to be consecrated by a lawful minister, to be spent and consumed in his service—as Bellarmine and the most learned men on both sides affirm that it is,—then is the offering of the bread and wine in the Church of England, a true and proper sacrifice; for it is usually provided by the churchwardens at the charges of the people, and being by them presented in the name of the people and placed on the altar or holy table before the Lord, is now no longer theirs but His; (grant that we receiving these *Thy* creatures of bread and wine) and being consecrated by the priest, is consumed and eaten by such as come prepared to partake thereof."†

Again, Mede, in a learned dissertation on the

* Bishop Andrewes' Sermons.

† Heylyn on the Creed, art. v. chap. vii.

Christian sacrifice, brings forward six propositions to be proved, of which the following stands as one: "That the commemoration of Christ, according to the style of the ancients, is also a sacrifice."* Again, with this one more passage from Thorndike, I will conclude, only remarking that these are but samples extracted from the writings of our principal divines; the whole spirit of whose doctrine fills many volumes, all equally and in various ways asserting this great necessary Catholic principle. Thus, then, Thorndike speaks: "For the same reason, and by the same correspondence between the sacrifices of the law and that of Christ's cross, it may be evident that it is not, nor can be, any disparagement, to the sacrifice of our Lord Christ upon the cross, to the full and perfect satisfaction, and propitiation for the sins of the world, which it hath made, that the Eucharist should be counted the sacrifice of Christ crucified mystically, and as in a sacrament, represented to and feasted upon by his people."†

But now it will be said by some,—wherefore all this? what has this to do with the distinctive errors of Romanism? Is not this a proof that our Church has too much of the spirit of Popery within her; and ought we not to regret, rather than to rejoice, in such a doctrine so clearly and

* Mede, *Christian Sacrifice*.

† Thorndike, *Epilog.* book iii. chap. v.

distinctly held? No; the nearer our Church can be shown to be, in her doctrines and in her practices, to the pure Church of Christ, in the three or four first centuries, the stronger ground we take against the opposition of the sects of Dissenters on one side, and the sect of Romanists in this country on the other;—the higher we can show that our Church advances in any doctrine which was confessedly a doctrine of the Church Catholic,—agreeing with the spirit and the usages of early times,—the worse for Rome, if we can show that they advance still higher. If we maintained the low latitudinarian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that it was a mere Christian act of worship, then might the Romanist very well maintain his ground against us, in asserting the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist; but when we agree with him that there *is* a sacrifice,—a sacrifice in a certain primitive Catholic sense, and show him that we know what that sense is,—what then can he have to say, when we bring against him the unjust, and unauthorised and anti-Catholic sense, in which he maintains the sacrifice distinct from ourselves. It is evident the higher our doctrine is, the worse error he is guilty of in going beyond it; and, therefore, the pains which I have taken now to show you from our liturgy and our writers the real doctrine which we hold of the Eucharistic sacrifice. And so let us now proceed to consider what the doctrine of Rome is.

We shall first have to examine the council of Trent; but here, as before, we shall be astonished at the ambiguousness of the expressions in which this doctrine is spoken of. Though some of the words are strongly expressive of a doctrine much advanced beyond our own, still they are so shaped as to enable them to shelter or defend themselves when attacked in controversy. It is only by looking to the *practice* of the Church illustrating their councils, and to many of their private writers, that we can detect the exact meaning of what they say. The council of Trent thus speaks. After reciting the facts of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ having offered himself upon the cross once for all, and then appointing a priesthood to carry on a similar visible sacrifice in his Church through all ages, it then goes on thus: "After the celebration of the old Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel sacrificed in memory of the departure from Egypt, He instituted a new Passover, *even HIMSELF, to be sacrificed by the Church, through the priests*, under visible signs, in memory of his departure from this world unto the Father." This "sacrificing of *himself by the Church*" is at least an equivocal expression; and though it is mentioned afterwards under "*visible signs*," yet when we know what the visible signs are, in their Church,—not *visible signs* at all, but the *tran-*

*substantiated** *body* of our Lord, we cannot but infer, that under this language, however guarded, is meant to be taught the actual and personal sacrifice of the Lord's body, by the hands of the priesthood. Afterwards it is said: "In the divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass, *that same Christ* is contained and offered in an unbloody manner, who on the altar of the cross offered himself with blood."† Here we are told nothing about a visible sign or species of bread and wine, but that it is the *same Christ*,—the only difference between the two being, that one is without blood, the other with.‡ Afterwards in the canons, we find the expressions rather more decided, as in the following: "If any shall say that in the Mass there is not offered to God *a true and proper* sacrifice;" where the expression *proper*, as understood in conjunction with the doctrine of transubstantiation would seem to forbid our interpreting it, as being only commemorative, or representative; and in the second canon again, it is thus: "If any shall say that in these words, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' Christ did not appoint the apostles to be priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should *offer his body and blood*, let him be accursed." The other canons proceed in the same language,

* This will be the subject of proof in the next Lecture.

† Conc. Trident. Session xxii. cap. i.

‡ Idem, cap. ii.

and the creed of Pope Pius IV confirms them.

The inference deduced, when we know the doctrine of transubstantiation (which must of necessity be taken into the account), must be evident, namely, that in the sacrifice of the Mass, the real, actual, human body of Christ is offered by the hands of the priest. But is this borne out by their private writers? yes, it is. Though it is cheerfully conceded by us that *some* of their writers have explained away a great deal that is objectionable; yet it must also be confessed by them that this doctrine of the personal sacrifice of the corporeal body of Christ is maintained as a part of their system generally. For instance, Harding the Jesuit asserts, that “Christ was twice immolated,—has twice shed his blood, and that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is a reiteration of that upon the cross;” and in another place he says, that “Christ truly and indeed, in respect of his very body and blood, was offered up to his Father under the form of bread and wine, in the daily sacrifice of the Church”;* while another writer says, that “the sacrament of the Eucharist is a real sacrifice, and a *continuation* of that upon the cross;”† while again, another writer says, “The sacrifice of the Mass is *the same* as that of the cross. It is substantially the same sacrifice

* Harding ap. Jewel, Reply, cap. xvii.

† Le Quien, cited by Courayer in his Defence, ii. 146.

because it is the same victim, the same Jesus Christ, who offers to his Father the same body and blood upon our altars, as he offered in Calvary.”* And coming down to writers of a more recent date, we find the very same thing still asserted. Dr. Butler, for instance, declares that the sacrifice of the Mass is truly real, because Jesus Christ is really therein contained, and really in it under the symbols of his passion offered up to his eternal Father ;† and in a book of recent date (1840), entitled “Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine,” in the explanation of the Mass,—it is thus asked : “What is the canon? *A.* It is the most sacred, essential, and substantial part of the Mass,—for therein is the *sacrifice effected*. *Q.* Why doth the priest begin the canon bowing his head? *A.* To signify the obedience of Christ unto his Father, in making himself a sacrifice for sin ;”‡—not, you observe, for having made himself so once upon the cross by his *death*, but for “*making himself*” then, there, and by the power of the priest who pronounces the words, “*Hoc est corpus meum.*” Just so in Dr. Butler’s catechism: “Is the Mass a *different* sacrifice from that of the cross? *A.* No; because the same Christ who once offered himself a bleeding victim to his heavenly Father

* Nicole, Esprit de M. Nicole, p. 533.

† Butler, Lect. viii. p. 228.

‡ Abridgment of Christian Doctrine. The Mass expounded, p. 129. *Dublin*, 1840.

on the cross, continues to offer himself in an unbloody manner by the hands of his priests, on our altars.”*

But there is no need of saying more. Courayer, one of the most liberal and candid of their writers, saw no use in attempting to deny it. He honestly confesses the fact, and regrets it. “It is of no use to deny,” says that writer, “that many theologians of the Romish Church took occasion of the name of sacrifice given to the Eucharist, to tell us of a fresh immolation and death, to attach to it an efficacy of its own, and an independent merit, to make us place therein a confidence which cannot but be superstitious, whenever it refers not to the sacrifice of the cross.”

With this candid confession and allowance of one of themselves, I shall conclude this portion of the subject. You will readily see, from all that I have said, the immeasurable difference between ourselves and Rome;—how, on our side, when we call the Eucharist a sacrifice, we call it so in the true primitive sense of the Church Catholic; how, when they call it so, they violate all the principles and spirit of the ancient language, and the ancient customs of Christianity. Ours is the *commemorative* celebration of the one great sacrifice once offered,—theirs the positive identical sacrifice of the Lord’s body, renewed every time the priest offers it. Ours is a devotional sacrifice of alms,

* Butler’s Catechism, *Dublin*, 1841, p. 61.

prayer, and praises,—theirs a carnal and earthly sacrifice performed by their own human hands. Ours is, in a sense, a real sacrifice, as presenting unto God of his own creatures bread and wine, to be consecrated to his service,—but theirs, a real sacrifice in the sense of the bread and wine made into the substance of Christ's body and blood, and so offered repeatedly, by the power of the priest in pronouncing the consecrating words—Ours is spiritual, theirs corporeal—ours is commemorative, theirs actual.

And behold the doctrines which flow out of it. Suffer me to set before you in juxtaposition the tenets of the two Churches. The Romanists hold that in the sacrifice of the Mass, the whole Christ, God and man, is offered up hypostatically, *i. e.* substantially, in the Eucharist, and is to be worshipped there by men, under the species of bread and wine. The Church, on the contrary, holds that it is not the divinity or the humanity of Christ, that is there offered, but only the sacramental body and blood. The Romanists hold, that the sacrifice of the Mass is available for the remission of sins to the dead, as well as to the living; and so they will perform hundreds of masses in a day, for the benefit of souls in purgatory; while, on the contrary, the Church holds that the oblation of the Eucharist being only a representation of that of the cross, it therefore can only be for the sins of the living,—for the

representation cannot have a greater efficacy than the principal. The Romanists hold, that it is right to have private Masses, in which the priest pretends to make the oblation, of himself, and by himself, without any person whatever standing by ; while, on the contrary, the Church holds that the holy Eucharist, besides being a sacrifice, must of necessity be a *communion* ; and that it is vital to the efficiency and virtue of the holy service, that *many* should be there to communicate both in spirit, and in prayer, and in praise, with God and with man. The Romanist holds, that even when the congregation is present, all that they have to do is to look on and hear ; all that they have to do when the priest elevates the host and the chalice, is to kneel down and adore, as though the holy elements were objects of their worship ; whereas, on the contrary, the Church holds that the Eucharist is a feast as well as a sacrifice, and that the symbols are to be eaten and drunk, as well as offered to God, and that the worshippers are to feed upon the heavenly banquet as a banquet, as well as to look on and worship in pious adoration ; and if we had no more to say than this, it would be sufficient,—the words of Christ at the institution,—“ *Take, eat, this is my body,*” and “ *Drink ye all of this.*” And thus our own divines continually speak—our homilies and our articles,—retaining all that is good, high, spiritual, and primitive in the one ; rejecting all that is carnal,

novel, anti-Scriptural, in the other. Thus our homily : “ We must take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice, lest of a communion it be made a private eating,” *i. e.* lest we lower it on the one side, by making it, with the Dissenters, nothing more than a communion, and lest we elevate on the other, and lose the memorial in the positive and corporeal sacrifice of Rome. And our 31st article thus : “ The offering of Christ *once made*, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it is commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”

And thus I hope, my brethren, this whole doctrine is clear to you. The evils which attach to *their* perversion of the doctrine of the holy sacrifice, are numerous ; while the blessings that attend *our* true and primitive doctrine are correspondingly great and signal.

1. One evil which attaches to their system, is a low and superstitious feeling in attributing to the priesthood certain mysterious, — I may almost say, miraculous powers, in thus, by the charm of a few words, performing a sacrificial act of God. It almost causes a shudder, even to think of it.

That they, human beings,—sinful beings,—they, in behalf of whom, as well as all others, Christ died,—should go through the empty pageant of a few outward actions and a few imperfect prayers, and should be thought by so doing to cause Christ, the holy and the righteous Son of God, to die over again, to offer his body and to shed his blood daily, nay, perhaps a hundred times in a day, over and over again! What sort of notion must the poor, the ignorant, and the simple, have of this device?—a sort of superstitious fear, and trembling, and horror, in beholding their ministers of religion thus standing before altars, like heathen priests of old, in the mysteries of their fanaticism, slaying the victims and offering the holocausts of their human invention. And what sort of notion must the wise, the learned, and the truly religious among them, have of it? Why, they must look upon it either with sorrow or with incredulity. They must either look upon it as a piece of trickery to deceive the simple, and so permit it to go on, as conveying some fancied advantages which they think it well not to meddle with,—or they must be led on from step to step to doubts and misgivings, and perhaps finally, as many are, to infidelity.

II. Another evil unavoidably attending the Romish doctrine is this,—a notion of external and formal worship being sufficient to please God. The people are led to their public worship, as it is

said, *to hear mass*. They are made the witnesses, the mere lookers on, the mere gazers at and hearers of actions and sounds, which are supposed to communicate to them divine blessings. The mass is pronounced in a low murmuring voice, with the priest turning his back towards the people, in a strange language, with a multitude of ceremonial actions of which the congregation cannot understand the meaning ; so that this habit must inevitably beget in their hearts an idea of transferring all their religious worship to the priest, and having none in themselves ;—of doing their religion, as it were, by deputy ;—of making it a sort of vicarious business, and so losing all that personal holiness and personal interest in religion and in worship, which we know to be desired of God, as a Being to be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

III. And a third evil is a degradation, and by degrees a total loss, of that high mystery of our religion, the one great sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross. I say, by degrees a total loss of it,—for by thus making a sacrifice of the Son of God before the people every day,—asserting that every priest daily performs it,—it follows that the great sacrifice of Christ is made a vulgar, common, ordinary transaction ; and so by its commonness it comes to pass that its high and solemn character is lost. The true sacrifice of Almighty God is degraded by this daily imitation and rehearsal of it by man ; and that which ought to be approached

with reverential feelings of awe and reserve, is so continually thrust before the public, that they must begin to think, by daily seeing it performed by a priest upon the altar, that after all it was not much to be performed by God upon Mount Calvary.

These are some of the unavoidable evils attending on their system. And now take our corresponding blessings.

1. There is in our Church an equal maintenance of all the high and spiritual privileges of the Christian priesthood as with them; but it is conjoined with a free and intelligent imparting to the people of a *spiritual meaning* of all that is said and done. There is a high and transcendental office in being "Steward of the mysteries," in being the priest of God "to offer gifts," but there is no assumption that he is performing any act of divinity; and so the people come to their devotions with a rational and understanding mind, being not required to believe that which is in contradiction to their knowledge, or in violation of their senses. There *is* a sacrifice—but it is a sacrifice in which the *people* are concerned, and the people take their part as well as the Priest;—for the sacrifice is their *alms-giving*, and their *prayers*, and their *praises*. The priest could no more perform the holy Eucharist without the people, than the people could without the priest.*

* Our Rubrics forbid the celebration of the holy communion,

There must be a junction and co-operation of the two. There must be an oblation of the people, prayers of the people, praises of the people, devout hearts, holy spirits, uplifted minds, intelligent aspirations, and all of the *people*. Above all, and I beseech you to remark this—a personal *communion* in the holy mysteries.—You are not left as mere witnesses, you do not come into the Church *to hear* Communion,—you do not gaze upon the Priest as though he were doing a vicarious office for you, and you had only to stand by, —but we offer you, and require of you, as necessary to the perfection of this wonderful mystery, permitted to you to be offered in the name of our Saviour, according to the Scripture,—“a *Communion* of the body of Christ,” and “a *Communion* of the blood of Christ.”

According to the tenor of our service, then, we call upon you to “*lift up your hearts.*” We call upon you not only for your bodily presence, but for your whole soul and spirit, as dedicated unto God. Why do men forsake this blessing? Why do men continual despite to this gracious and noble privilege of our Church, snatched as a fire-brand out of the burning, and restored to us when it had well nigh perished in the accumulated misrule

“except there be a *convenient number* to communicate with the priest, according to his discretion.”—“There shall be no communion, except four, or *three at the least*, communicate with the priest.”—See Rubrics at the end of the Communion Service.

and perversion of Romish dominion. If men are not *communicants* when such great things are in store for them, are they in reality much better than the Romanist whose religion they so violently deprecate? For only consider what is that man's participation in the body of Christ, who comes to Church every Sunday, *hears* communion, but never *does* it. Is he not a Romanist in *spirit*? Is he not doing the very thing that we blame them for?—"HEARING *mass*,"—making his religion an external form, and not a living principle; making the priest, and the few communicants that remain out of the congregation, to do a vicarious office *for him*, to perform the sacrifice *for him*, to give alms *for him*, to pray and praise God *for him*? My brethren,—It is well for us to think of this. It seems to grow out of the subject as a practical rebuke to ourselves, lest while we are preaching to others, we become ourselves cast away. Rouse yourselves, therefore, and awake to the high privileges which your Church affords you.

"*Lift up your hearts.*" Be ready with a good and devout response. Not as the Romanist does, with nothing to follow, but as we teach with the body and blood of Christ presently to be administered to every communicant personally. "*Lift up your hearts.*" Be ready with a cheerful and spiritual response, as though you were aware in the action to be done, of the high advantages which God has furnished, and your Church has

preserved for you. "*Lift up your hearts.*" Lift them up, not to any priest on earth, but to that high priest who stands now at the right hand of God, ever making intercession for you; not to any sacrifice on earth, however beautiful it may be as a *memorial*, but to that one sacrifice by which once in the end of the world, HE appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of HIMSELF.

"*Lift up your hearts.*" Be ready, I repeat, when this is said, ever to make your cheerful and glad response, *using* the privileges of your beloved Church, and the customs of your forefathers from time out of mind, and say,—"*We lift them up unto the Lord.*"

SERMON XII.

MATT. XXVI. 26, 27, 28.

“ Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for THIS IS MY BLOOD.”

THE Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist contains within it two peculiar features which are not found in any other of the sacraments either of Rome or England. First, it is of a sacrificial character. It has offerings and oblations to be made unto God as a commemorative sacrifice. This was the subject of our consideration in the preceding Lecture, in which we reflected on the error of the Romish Church in teaching her people the doctrine of the *Sacrifice of the Mass*. But secondly, it is of a very peculiar character in regard to the form and matter which were appointed by our Lord in its institution. Bread and wine were the matter appointed by our Lord, but they do not remain mere bread and wine in their sacramental

use,—a certain mysterious change is wrought in them by the operation of the Holy Ghost ; and to this mysterious change it will be our duty to advert in the present Lecture, reflecting upon another error of the Church of Rome equally great, and equally important,—that of TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Of all the subjects which it has been my duty as yet to consider, the present is the one which I approach with the greatest reluctance, for it is, as you must perceive, of peculiar delicacy and difficulty. It requires a very careful and reverential way of speaking, lest we should be unconsciously trespassing upon the hallowed precincts of God's holy mysteries, lest we should be infringing that awe and holy reserve with which the deep things of God should ever be contemplated by the imperfect vision of man. I approach it with reluctance,—but I approach it of necessity. The question is a vital one. It contains within it one of the grossest of the perversions of Rome ; and however unwilling we might be on common occasions to make it a subject of discussion, the necessity of doing so in the present instance will, I hope, be apparent. It is not *our* fault that we are compelled to define and investigate this holy mystery ; it is the fault of *Rome*. For it slept in holy rest and abeyance ; it was held in silent reserve and humility of faith, until Rome, by her presumptuous confidence, presumed to explain

the manner of the operation of God's Holy Spirit. It is, then, *their* fault, not ours. The only thing we have now to do, is to preserve within us, while we are considering this holy mystery, such reverential and devotional feelings as the subject necessarily requires.

There is one general principle upon which none of us will have any difficulty. All men will readily agree, that in things consecrated to God, there is a certain change in their relative value, a change in their aspect, a change in their use. For instance, there is a difference between a building of mere stone and mortar, which is common and profane ; and the same building, when consecrated and set apart by prayer to God, and ceremonial rites, as His peculiar dwelling-place. Not but that it is the same building, but its *use* is different. We behold it with a different aspect. It has undergone a certain change in our estimation ; and where we formerly would have entered with no farther external marks of observation than we should have used in any other building ;—directly it is set apart to God, we consider it as the place “where God's honour dwelleth,” and we enter not therein, save with uncovered head and reverent thoughts.

So also in a layman, or common Christian. When he becomes by ordination a minister of God, there certainly is a change both in the relative value which he feels in himself, and in which he

is looked upon by others. He is the same man, speaks the same language, and has the same general outward appearance; but by the act of consecration and setting apart as holy unto God, he is different. Men call him differently, look upon him differently; and when, perhaps, the idle and the frivolous would have felt before no hindrance to their usual courses of vain and sinful conversation in his presence, now that he is holy unto God, they do feel a sort of check and restraint, as though a change had come across him.

This sort of change in things holy, all will readily allow. Let us apply it then to the elements of bread and wine as used in the holy Eucharist. At first they are, of course, no more than common bread and wine; but they are brought into the Church, and before the assembled people, they are offered up on the holy table by the hands of the priest, and are thereby dedicated and consecrated to God's service. They are no longer to be put to any common or ordinary use, such as they might have been previously.* But,

* This may be seen by a comparison of two rubrics of our Church. The first immediately before the prayer for the Church militant: "THE PRIEST shall *then* place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." And the second at the termination of the service, wherein it is directed that, if unconsecrated bread or wine remain after it has been offered, *the Curate is to have it to his own use*; if consecrated, *the Communicants are reverently to eat and drink the same*. So that none of it, when once offered by the priest, is any longer common bread and wine.

then, still farther. If we turn to the Eucharistic service as used in the Church of England, we shall find, that after this solemn offering to God, there is a prayer, which is called the prayer of consecration. In the course of this prayer, the priest is directed to say,—“Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.” He is also directed to perform certain actions, as in imitation of Christ, breaking the bread, and laying his hands upon it; and taking up the cup, and laying his hands upon the wine contained in it. Now all this cannot be without a meaning. Observe the peculiarity of action,—that of *blessing*; observe the peculiarity of *prayer*, that we “in partaking of the bread and wine, may be partakers of *Christ’s body and blood*,”—that is, by virtue of some process of God’s heavenly power, the bread and wine may become to those who are about to receive it, the body and blood of our Redeemer. Here, then, is evidently a farther change. By being offered up to God on the holy table, in the first instance, the bread and wine became dedicated to God, and set apart to His use; but so did the alms that were then offered up together with them. But now the bread and wine are separated from the alms,

and made more than holy or dedicated to God. They are, in some sense or other, made unto those who may receive them in faith,—*the body and blood of our Redeemer*.

But let us see a little closer what our Church maintains on this head in the course of her public formularies. Let us look at the 28th article. You will there find it asserted thus:—“The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death, insomuch, that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of *the body of Christ*, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of *the blood of Christ*.” Again, if we take our catechism:—“Q. What is the inward part or thing signified in the Lord’s Supper? A. The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper. Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby? A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the *body and blood of Christ*, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.” Again, let us advert to the communion service itself, and observe the tenor of its language. Just before the prayer of consecration we find this expression: “Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to *eat the flesh* of thy dear Son, and to *drink his blood*, that our sinful

bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed by his most precious blood." In the address to the communicants, in similar language it is said: "For then we spiritually *eat the flesh of Christ*, and *drink his blood*." In the words of distribution, we find it again: "The *body* of our Lord Jesus Christ;" "The *blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ." And in the prayer immediately after: "Almighty and Everlasting God, we most heartily thank thee, that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious *body and blood* of thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ." Observe all this. They are not accidental expressions occurring once or twice, but they evidently convey a systematic teaching. They are the spirit of the whole communion service. Again, let us turn to our book of homilies. The same thing will appear, and in very nearly the same language: "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord, there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea the communion of *the body and blood of the Lord* in a marvellous incorporation, which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the very bond of our conjunction with Christ, is, through faith, wrought in the souls of

the faithful." All these references will be sufficient to show what the opinion of the Church of England is in this great question; namely, that there is in the holy Eucharist, to the faithful who communicate therein, a *real* presence of Christ*—*negatively*, that it is not mere bread and wine, not a mere sign,—and *positively*, that there is in the consecration of the elements some mysterious change; that by the words of invocation to the Holy Ghost, the holy elements become something more than they were before; and that to the souls of the faithful, the body and blood of Christ are in *some* sense verily and indeed present.

You will not fail to observe, that I say "in *some* sense." The question is, what *is* that sense? The answer to this question will involve the differences between ourselves and Rome. We agree, as just seen by our public documents, that there is *some* change. We agree that there is in the sacrament *some* mysterious effect of the power of

* It behoves us, however, to be very cautious in the use of this phrase, and to take care that it conveys no more meaning to the hearer than is intended by the speaker or writer. Bishop Burnet says: "By *real* we understand *true*, in opposition both to fiction and imagination, and to those *shadows* that were in the Mosaical dispensation, in which the *manna*, the *rock*, the *brazen serpent*, but most eminently *the cloud of glory*, were the types and shadows of the Messiah, with whom came grace and *truth*. In this sense, we acknowledge a *real presence of Christ* in the sacrament."—Bishop Burnet on the Articles, folio, p. 317.

the Holy Ghost, in making the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. So far the agreement; but immediately after this the difference arises. What is the *sense* in which this assertion is made? They have one sense, and we have another. Rome proceeds upon her usual principle of addition, and asserts that not only is there a mysterious change of the holy elements, but also that the original nature of the bread and wine passes away, and another nature comes into their place; that nothing but their external accidents remain,—that they become the actual and entire body and blood of our Lord Christ;—and to this notion she gives the name of TRANSUBSTANTIATION. The very word defines the idea. The *substance* of the bread and wine is *transferred* into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. Now this notion was never heard of in the early ages. The fathers do indeed abound in passages, where there is a *spiritual* change described—(as we shall have to show in the latter portion of this discourse),—and in their usual figurative language, these expressions are sometimes very strong. But it will be easily seen that they signify in reality no more than our own doctrine of the real presence of Christ,—a real presence in spirit and in faith, and not in positive substance. Many of the fathers speak of a change, under the words *transfiguration*, *transition*, *migration*, *mutation*, and the like, but they

all refer to that *spiritual* change of the holy elements, in which our own Church delights to speak equally with themselves. No ; we may safely say there is no one passage of a genuine author that can be produced of the first four, perhaps we may say five, or even six centuries, in which *transubstantiation*, or any thing like it, can be shown to have been held or taught in the Church. On the contrary, as will be shown at page 328 the testimonies of the early Church are directly in the teeth of it. But this by the way ; our business is now to show the doctrine of the present Church of Rome.

The doctrine of transubstantiation began to be entertained in the ninth century. Paschasius Radbert (A. D. 830), a monk of Corby, first proclaimed it as a determined article of faith ; asserting that after the consecration of the elements, nothing remained of the symbols of bread and wine but their external figure ; but that the body and blood of Christ were locally present,—the same body that was born of the Virgin, suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead. In the same century, he was followed by Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, (A. D. 853) who wrote in a similar manner.* “ The invisible priest changes his visible creatures into the substance of his own flesh and blood, by a

* These writers were opposed on the other side by Ratram or Bertram, Johannes Scotus, Amalarius, and Rabanus Maurus.

secret power. The taste and form of bread and wine remain, but the nature and substance is altogether changed into the body and blood of Christ." We then pass on to the eleventh century,—and there we find an extraordinary account of Berengarius, a man of great learning and piety, who took part in the controversy against the prevailing notion of any miraculous change of the holy elements. But the persecution and violence of Gregory VII caused him publicly to make a recantation of his opinion, and the following article was put before him as the doctrine of the Church: "The bread deposited upon the altar becomes, after consecration, the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits on the right hand of the Father; and the wine placed on the altar becomes, after consecration, the true blood which flowed from the side of Christ."* In the same manner, Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, (A. D. 1070) asserted that "before consecration it is the bread and wine, but while it is being consecrated, it is converted into the flesh and blood of Christ."† And Bonaventura (A. D. 1250), carries the question to its very highest climax of profanation. He goes far beyond all others. I almost question the propriety even of quoting his words; they are these: a question is asked,

* See Mosheim's Church History. Vol. II, p. 508.

† Lanfranc on the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

whether the body of Christ is on the altar in its own natural dimensions, and he replies :—" The body of Christ is living ; and if living, organic ; and if organic, hath dimensions ; therefore, if on the altar it be not detached from life, neither is it from dimensions."—" The body of Christ, or Christ, sees and hears, although it speaks not, lest it be discovered ; but the outward senses presuppose dimensions, therefore it is there in dimension."†

Hitherto I have only quoted from private writers. In the same century as the last-mentioned writer, but rather preceding him (A. D. 1215), took place the Council of Lateran,—Innocent III being pope of Rome : and in that council the word transubstantiation was first invented. The *doctrine*, as I have just shown, was well understood, and by private writers it was constantly set before the people, but no council had decreed it authoritatively as a tenet of the faith ; and the *word* transubstantiation was never broached as expressive of the doctrine until this council. The following are the words of the Council of Lateran : " There is one universal Church of the faithful, out of which no one can be saved, in which the same Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar is truly contained under the figures of bread

† Bonavent. lib. iv. dist. x. art. i. q. ii.

and wine,—the bread being *transubstantiated* into the body, and the wine into the blood, by the divine power.”* From this period we go on through much confusion and darkness, until the struggles of the Reformation commenced. At this period the Church of Rome again thought proper to pronounce her authoritative opinion on this doctrine. She did so at the Council of Trent, as follows: “Since Christ our Redeemer truly said, that that which he offered under the appearance of bread was his body, therefore the Church of God has ever been persuaded, and this holy synod declares it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread, into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord; and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood,—which conversion the holy Catholic Church [Roman] suitably and properly calls *Transubstantiation*.† And this is confirmed afterwards by the canons of the council, as an article of faith, under anathema, as follows: “If any shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy

* Concil. Lateran. A.D. 1215, Canon I. It is not necessary here to enter into the doctrines of *Consubstantiation*, *Impanation*, and other shades of erroneous teaching, that grew out of this controversy, and were adopted by some of the Protestant sects. The history of these would more properly belong to a general history of Protestantism;—we are now confined to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, as maintained against Rome.

† Conc. Trident. Session xiii. c. iv.

eucharist there is contained truly, really and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so whole Christ; but shall say that He is only in it in sign, or figure, or power, let him be accursed.” —“ If any shall say that in the holy sacrament of the eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and remarkable conversion of the *whole substance* of the bread into the body, and the *whole substance* of the wine into the blood, while only the *appearance* of the bread and wine remain, which conversion the Catholic Church [Roman] most aptly styles *Transubstantiation*, let him be accursed.”*

In this we have the whole doctrine as clearly set out as any one could desire. There can be no misunderstanding. In the first canon it is asserted that there is substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity. This must of course be the case, as the divinity of Christ can never be separated from his humanity, nor his humanity from his divinity. And in the second canon it is asserted, that nothing remains of the bread and wine. It is altogether, as to its substance, gone; its appearance only remains, and into its place succeeds the substance of

* Conc. Trident. Sacrament of Eucharist, Canon i. and ii.

Christ's body and blood. I shall make no comment upon this. The words speak for themselves. I shall leave it with you, my brethren, for your consideration and reflection.

But it will be asked—Is not Rome changed? Are not her doctrines in the present enlightened days more temperate and modified? Do the people of her communion in *this* age, and in *this* country, believe all that is set down in her formal articles and councils? I know not what enlightened individuals may privately hold in contradiction to the public teaching of their Church, but this is well known—*they dare not say so*, for excommunication would immediately follow. But as to public and authoritative teaching, I do not see how Rome can ever change. Her doctrine of infallibility precludes it. If she would agree with us, that Churches have erred, and may err again; that if our predecessors have pronounced an article of faith erroneously as contrary to God's word,—we have a right and a duty to restore that which is true. If this simple proposition were allowed by her, her union with us might even yet be achieved: but at present, by the doctrine of infallibility, whatever has once been pronounced by the Church can never be wrong; therefore she must be the same to-day as she was three hundred years ago. No: Rome dare not move a single stone of her public foundation of faith, as given at the Council of Trent. Let her do so,

and she is altogether lost as a Church. It is impossible therefore at present that she should be changed.

It is far, however, from any question of possibility,—she does not *wish* to change. Her private writers, from the Council of Trent downwards, will show you the same doctrines, both in spirit and in words, with those already cited. Let us take some few of them. Cardinal Bellarmine (A. D. 1560) says,—“The bread is in truth not annihilated, although nothing remains of it after the consecration :”* *i. e.* it does not pass into *nothing*, but passes into the substance and flesh of Christ. And he says in other places, that the body and blood are “corporeally present,” that they are “sensibly touched by the hands,”—“broken and bruised by the teeth,”† and so forth. Another writer, Bossuet, bishop of Meaux (A. D. 1650), writes thus : “Conducted by His all-powerful word, who does whatsoever He pleases, faith acknowledges in the divine mystery no other substance than that which this same word expresses, that is, the real body and the real blood of our Redeemer Jesus Christ, into which the bread and wine are by his power miraculously converted. It is this mysterious change that we now express by the appropriate term *Transubstantiation*.”‡

* Bellarmin. de Euch. iii. 18.

† Ib. lib. i. chap. ii.

‡ Bossuet, Exposition, &c. See the chapter on *Transubstantiation*.

Or if we change the scene, and come into our own country, we shall still find the same doctrine openly maintained. The following article of faith was brought into the convocation in the reign of Henry VIII, and signed by a majority of the bishops; and held therefore publicly as the faith of this Christian land:—

“*Fourth.* As touching the sacrament of the altar, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought, and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, *substantially*, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption: and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is *corporeally*, really, and *in very substance* exhibited, distributed, and received of all them which receive the said sacrament.”*

But to come at once to more modern times. Let us take Dr. Butler’s Catechism. When we come to that portion of it which treats of the

* Fuller’s Church History, book v. Extracted from the Convocation Records.

blessed eucharist, we find the following questions and answers : “*Q.* What is the blessed eucharist ? *A.* The body and blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the appearances of bread and wine. *Q.* What do you mean by the appearances of bread and wine ? *A.* The taste, colour, and form of bread and wine, which still remain after the bread and wine are *changed into the body and blood of Christ.* *Q.* Are both the body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and under the appearance of wine ? *A.* Yes ; Christ is whole and entire true God and true man under the appearance of each. *Q.* Did Christ give power to the priests of his Church *to change bread and wine into his body and blood ?* *A.* Yes ; when he said to his apostles at his last Supper, ‘Do this for a commemoration of me.’” — And afterwards again : “*Q.* At what part of the mass are the bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ ? *A.* At the consecration. *Q.* By whom are the bread and wine *changed into the body and blood of Christ ?* *A.* By the priest, [not by Almighty God], By the priest, but in virtue of the words of Christ, whose person the priest represents at the awful moment of consecration.”* Again, in another book which is circulated among Romanists at this day, as an authoritative book of teaching, called “*An Abridgment*

* Butler’s Catechism, *Dublin*, 1841, p. 59.

of the *Christian Doctrine*,” we find the following:

—“ Q. What is the blessed Eucharist? A. It is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, under the outward forms of bread and wine. Q. In what manner is Christ present under these forms? A. He is present, truly, really, and substantially. Q. By what means is the body and blood of Christ made present under the outward forms of bread and wine? A. By a real conversion or change of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ, which conversion is wrought by the power of God, when the most holy words of consecration, instituted by Christ, are spoken by his priest, and is fitly called transubstantiation by the Councils of Lateran and Trent, which signifies a passage or conversion of one substance into another.”*

Thus then, it is satisfactorily shown that the doctrine of transubstantiation defined by the Councils of Lateran and Trent, is still held, and publicly taught by Rome. Their faith is still the same. Their errors the same. Their additions to the Catholic faith the same.

And now we have arrived at the last portion of our discussion in this lecture. I have shown you what the doctrine of our own Church is, and I have shown you what the doctrine of Rome is. It now remains that I appeal to Catholic antiquity and the Scriptures, in order to show that *our* doc-

* Abridgment, *Dublin*, 1840, p. 80.

trine is correct, and consequently, *theirs* incorrect. And first, *Scripture*.

The principal places of Scripture which are brought forward by the Romanists in favour of their transubstantiation are the words of institution, and the 6th chapter of St. John, wherein Christ speaks of "eating his flesh and drinking his blood." As to the words of institution—"This is my body." In the Douay Bible we find the following note appended to St. Matthew xxvi. 26 :—"He does not say 'This is the *figure* of my body,'—but 'this is my body.' (2nd Council of Nice, Act. vi.) Neither does he say, '*In* this, or *with* this is my body.' but absolutely, 'This is my body,' which plainly implies transubstantiation." Now, if it were true grammatically, or logically, that the word "*is*" must signify in this passage the positive assertion, that the two points which it connects, "This," and "body" are identified ; then it must follow that the rule must apply to all other parts of Scripture equally—for a rule cannot arbitrarily be applied to one place and not to another. If so—consider these passages :—"The three branches *are* three days." (Gen. xl. 12.) "The seven good kine *are* seven years." (Gen. xli. 26.) "The field *is* the world." (Matt. xiii. 38.) "I *am* the vine," (John xv. 1), and many other passages of this sort—and what will become of them ? But more particularly let us consider more closely the very passage relating

to the Eucharist as given in St. Luke xxii. 20,—
 “This cup *is* the New Testament in my blood.”
 Now this text must be examined by the same grammatical rule as the others, and we should then find that the cup must be transubstantiated and not the wine in the cup. If however this cannot be granted, then neither can the other, and so the words of institution prove nothing.

Again, as to the words in the sixth chapter of St. John, where Christ speaks of his flesh and of his blood. *Figuratively* it may be transferred to the Eucharist, but *really* it cannot be; in *our* sense it may be, in *theirs* it cannot. But without entering into any argument upon the matter, let us only take the testimony of the Church. Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Ambrose, Austin, Theophylact,—all refer the words to a *spiritual* sense. To take one or two passages for an example.—St Ambrose: “That is not the bread of life which goes into the body, but that which supports the substance of the soul. This bread is touched by faith, it is seen by faith; it is not comprehended by the vision.”* And St. Chrysostom:—“These things have in them nothing carnal, nor any carnal consequence;”† and St. Austin, commenting on the very words:—“It is a figure of speech teaching us that we must communicate with the passion of our Lord, and that we must

* De Sacramentis, lib. v. chap. iv.

† Chrysostom. ad Johann. Homil. xlvii.

treasure him up kindly and usefully in the memory, because his flesh was crucified and wounded for us.”*

But it is needless to enter into this question farther. Many of the best Romanist writers themselves allow that Scripture proof cannot be brought on their side;—that Scripture proof only makes for *that* presence of Christ in the sacrament which the Church of England holds, and not for theirs.† They allow this, but appeal to tradition. To tradition, then, let us go—that is, to the testimony of the fathers. And what do we behold? Never was there on any subject of divinity so strong an array of writers, and so strongly expressing themselves in every variety of way, in every country, and in every age, as we find on this great subject. From the West—the Latin Church, and from the East—the oriental Churches; in all, it is the same universal testimony. The only wonder is, how men, who are learned and intelligent, can so stedfastly resist the evidence of truth which stands in such array against them. But what is this testimony?

Towards the close of the first century, we find *Ignatius* speaking in the following words:—he is describing certain heretics who denied the incarnation of Christ, and he says:—“They do not admit of Eucharists and oblations,

* August de Doctr. xi. John vi. 51.

† See these authors in Bishop Taylor’s work on the Real Presence. Works, vol. x. p. 435.

because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, which flesh suffered for us, and which the Father of his goodness raised again.”* This place is brought forward by the Romanists to favour their opinions, but there is no mention of *transubstantiation*. The word “*flesh*” is introduced to mark the *heresy*,—to signify in a pointed manner the reason of those persons refusing to celebrate the sacrament of the Eucharist,—because they denied Christ to have come in the flesh;—it makes, therefore, for *our* real presence, but does not favour them. But let us go on.

In the second century, *Justin Martyr* describes the Eucharist, and says:—“We call these things to memory, and in all the oblations which we offer, we praise with blessing the Creator of all, through his Son Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit”† He describes the bread and the cup, but says nothing of the *flesh* and *blood* of Christ;—“We do these things in memory.”

In the third century, *Tertullian*: “The bread being received and distributed to his disciples, he made it his body by saying, ‘This is my body,’ *i. e.* the figure of my body;” and *Origen*:—“It is not the matter of the bread, but the word which is spoken over it which profits him that eats it worthily, and this indeed, as a *typical* and *symbolical* body.”§

* Ignatius ad Smyrn. vi.

† Justin M. Apol. ii. p. 97. ‡ Contr. Marc. lib. iv.

§ Origen ad Matt. xv. 11.

In the fourth century,—*Cyril of Jerusalem*.—In this writer, there is certainly a very strong passage on which the Romanist might seize as making on his side:—"Consider them (the elements) not as mere bread and wine, for, by our Lord's express declaration, they are the body and blood of Christ, and though your taste may suggest that they are bread and wine, yet let your faith keep you firm. Judge not the thing by your taste, but, under a full persuasion of faith, be you undoubtedly assured that you are vouchsafed the body and blood of Christ." Now, this passage might be asserted to favour transubstantiation. It is a specimen of many others of a like kind, where the figurative language runs very high. The slightest consideration, however, would show that there cannot be any transubstantiation;—a change by *faith* there is,—a real presence of Christ there is, according to our own doctrine, but certainly no word of a change of *substance*. Fortunately it happens that we have another passage in St. Cyril which confirms this notion, which, if we were inclined to doubt of the former, would immediately set us right:—"We receive the Eucharist in all fulness of faith, as the body and blood of Christ. For under the *type* of bread you have his body given you, and under the *type* of wine you receive his blood, that so partaking of the body and blood of Christ, you may become flesh of his flesh and blood of his blood."*

* Cyril of Jerusalem, Myst. Cat. iv. and v.

And again,—*St. Chrysostom* :

“ Before the bread is sanctified we call it bread, but the divine grace sanctifying it, through the mediation of the priest, it is freed from the appellation of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord’s body, although *the nature of bread has continued in it.*”*

Again, *St. Augustin* :

“ Understand what I have said *spiritually*,—you are not about to eat this body which you see ;—I have commended a sacrament unto you, which being spiritually understood, will give you life.”†

In the fifth century,—*Theodore* :

“ You are caught in the net which you yourself have laid. For the mystic signs do not recede from their nature after consecration, but they remain *in their former substance, and figure and form*, and can be seen and touched as before ; but they are *understood to be* those things which they have been made, and are thought so, and are revered as the things which they are thought.”‡

In the sixth century,—*Ephrem* :

“ No man that hath any reason, will say that the nature of palpable and impalpable, visible and invisible, is the same ; for so the body of Christ which is received by the faithful, does not depart from its own sensible substance ; and yet it is united to a spiritual grace.”§

* Chrysost. ad Cæsar. cont. Apollinarem.

† Aug. Ep. ad Bonifacium. ‡ Theod. Dial. ii. tom. iv. p. 85.

§ Ephrem ad Photium, Cod. 229.

In the seventh century,—*Isidore* :

“As the visible substances of bread and wine nourish the outward man, so the word of Christ, who is the bread of life, refresheth the souls of the faithful, being received by faith.”*

Thus then we have one continued stream of testimony for the first seven centuries, against the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. Nothing can be more satisfactory, nothing more complete. All along you will observe the full doctrine of the real presence steadily maintained—even as we maintain it in a *spiritual* sense,—but no mention of any corporeal sense, no mention of any change of one substance into another substance, no mention of the body of Christ, or the blood of Christ being received in any other sense than that of faith. It is true that the Romanist will insist that real presence *means* transubstantiation—that they are identical,—and he would dexterously evade the question when pressed home, by asserting that the Scriptures and the fathers, when they speak of “eating Christ’s flesh,” and “drinking Christ’s blood,” and “discerning the Lord’s body,” or being “guilty of the Lord’s body,” and the like,—they will assert that these expressions *mean* transubstantiation. Thus, for instance, in the writings of Gother: he begins by proving the doctrines of the real presence just exactly in the

* Isidore, Orig. lib. vi. c. 19.

way we should desire ; and he quotes from Luther to strengthen his arguments, to the following effect :—" Among the fathers there is not one who entertained a doubt concerning the real presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist." A true assertion—one to which the Church of England cheerfully subscribes. Having done this he then insidiously glides off into transubstantiation, in this way :—" The real presence being established, the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is neither more nor less than the real presence properly understood, follows as a necessary consequence."

But surely it by no means follows,—in this lies the whole question. It by no means follows that because I believe the body of Christ and the blood of Christ to be present before me really *by faith*, and to be imparted to me verily and indeed *in faith*, and that by the words of the consecrating priest, to me in faith beholding, the holy bread and wine become really and spiritually changed,—that, therefore, the substance of bread and wine have altogether departed, and into their place, another substance, the body of my Saviour, His entire humanity, and His entire divinity have succeeded. Surely these are two very different doctrines, however speciously one may be dressed up to fit the other. It is the turning point of the whole error. We assert the fact of the real presence, and leave it there in faith and humility, not defining it ; they take it up and will define it.

We believe and adore in silence ; they must needs dive into the counsels of God and explain His ways. We merely assert the thing, they must needs assert the *manner* ; and, as all men must do, when they thus attempt beyond their strength, to define God's counsels, they have fallen into a grievous and presumptuous error. In the words of Bp. Taylor: " The question is not whether the symbols be changed into Christ's body and blood, for it is granted on all sides ; but whether this conversion be sacramental and figurative, or natural and bodily. The question is not whether Christ be really taken, but whether He be taken in a spiritual or in a natural manner. We say the conversion is figurative, mysterious, and sacramental ; they say it is proper, natural, and corporeal. We affirm that Christ is really taken by faith, by the spirit, to all real effects of His passion ; they say He is taken by the *mouth*, and that the spiritual and virtual taking Him in virtue or effect, though done in the sacrament, is not sufficient."* Which of these doctrines is the truth, as more according to the testimony of antiquity, more according to that faith which God has given us, and never requires to be exercised in contradiction to our senses ; above all, more according with the spirit and words of holy Scripture, let any reasonable man decide.

* Bishop Taylor. Real Presence, Works, vol. ix. p. 433.

For ourselves: let it be a lesson to us, my brethren, in two ways. First, that we presume not to examine too closely, or attempt to define too minutely, the secret and mysterious ways of God. Because Uzza put forth his hand to touch the ark of God, the anger of the Lord was kindled against him, and he died. There are certain truths in our religion which we must not touch—only look at—only believe: immediately that we touch them we die. Let the Romanist attempt to define the Incarnation, the Unity in Trinity, the Resurrection, Regeneration, and many other divine questions, and immediately he would fall into some grievous error; but let him look at them only in faith, without a definition, and he may hold them in simplicity and truth. So if he had suffered this mysterious question to remain in its proper silence, if he had never presumed to determine the manner in which the presence of Christ was manifested,—even as *Scripture* has not determined the manner, but has only pronounced the thing,—then might he to this day have preserved the faith of the Church in this respect inviolate. Let *us* be silent then,—adore with faith, contemplate with reverence, and receive with gratitude,—remembering that “although things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, secret things belong unto the Lord our God.”

And secondly, let it be a lesson to us, that

while we abstain from the profane presumption just described, we yet take good care that our thoughts and hearts are sufficiently elevated in the contemplation of this holy mystery, so as to embrace all its high and spiritual privileges, even though they be beyond our understanding. There is no reason that we should descend to the low and rationalistic views of dissent, and pronounce the holy Eucharist but a sign or token of Christian love, and deprive it of all its mystery and awful reserve, because we cannot ascend with the Romanist, and pronounce it a miraculous interference of God. We may keep our middle course ; we may deny against the Romanist, that bread and wine are of necessity transubstantiated into the flesh and blood of Christ, without asserting with the dissenter, that the holy Eucharist is nothing more than a feast of love. We may and ought to believe and feel that there are to *us* quite as great privileges in this holy feast, as there can be to *him* ; that Christ's body and blood are just as really and vividly before *us*, as they are before *him* ; nay more so, because *his* notion is lowered by a carnal and earthly sense, *ours* elevated by a spiritual and heavenly sense. The holy Supper of the Lord may be and ought to be—as our homily declares it (expressions taken out of the Fathers)—“ The salve of immortality, the sovereign preservative against death, a deificial communion, the pledge of our eternal health,

the defence of faith, the hope of our resurrection, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, the conservatory to everlasting life; not regarding the terrene and earthly creatures which remain, but always cleaving by faith to that rock whence we may derive the sweetness of everlasting salvation." Yes; without debasing it by their fond inventions, Christ's body may be to us "His glorious body;" and Christ's blood, "His precious blood-shedding;" we may "taste and see how gracious the Lord is," we may "discern the Lord's body;" He may "dwell in us, and be one with us, and we one with Him"—all these privileges may be before *us* really and vitally, without the necessity of our defining the manner or presuming to say *how* they are brought to pass.

Wherefore let me conclude, by warning you in the words of our Church, that "FAITH is the necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies. When a great number of the Israelites were overthrown in the wilderness, Moses, Aaron, and Phineas did eat manna and pleased God; 'for that they understood,' saith St. Augustin, 'that visible meat, *spiritually*. Spiritually they hungered for it, spiritually they tasted it, that they might be spiritually satisfied.' 'Therefore,' saith St. Cyprian, 'when we do these things, we need not whet our teeth, but with sincere faith break and divide that whole bread; it is well known that the meat we seek for

in this Supper is *spiritual* food ; the nourishment of our soul, a *heavenly* refection, not an earthly ; an *invisible* meat, not a bodily ; a *ghostly* substance, not a carnal ; so that to think that without faith, we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, is but to dream of a gross carnal feeding, basely subjecting and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures ;—whereas, by the Council of Nicene, we ought to lift up our minds by *faith*, and leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the Sun of righteousness ever shineth. Take then this lesson, O thou that art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father,—that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, thou be satisfied with spiritual meat ;—that thou look up with faith upon the holy body and blood of thy God ;—that thou marvel with reverence,—that thou touch it with the mind,—that thou receive it with the hand of thy *heart*, and then take it fully with thy *inward man*."

SERMON XIII.

ST. MATTHEW XXVI. 27.

“ And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, DRINK YE ALL OF IT, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”

THE doctrines of the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, and of *Transubstantiation*, by no means stand alone as Romish errors in the holy sacrament of the eucharist. There are many others, differing in degree, but all involving something of importance, which naturally flow out of them. Such, for instance, as the elevation and adoration of the host;—the carrying it about in solemn processions, in which the people fall down and pay it divine worship;—the doctrine of masses for the dead, in which the priest is supposed to offer an expiatory sacrifice beneficial to souls detained in purgatory;—all these are doctrines which a little observation will show to be consequents of the main errors of “the mass” and “transubstantiation.” We can easily imagine that the host being

once looked upon by the pious Christian as the very and substantial body of the Lord Christ, should soon after be attended with adoration. If it be the real, corporeal, local body, worship as a necessary consequence would follow. Nor are we surprised, when once we understand or believe that every priest celebrating the Lord's supper offers the sacrifice of the Son of God anew, that a doctrine should follow, coupled with purgatory, teaching that such sacrifices daily performed would release the souls there detained. It seems to follow as a natural chain of reasoning.

Against these, together with many other subsidiary points of error both in teaching and practice, our Church throughout her Articles solemnly protests. As in the twenty-fifth article: "The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them;" and in the twenty-eighth: "The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped;" and in the thirty-first: "The sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick *and dead*, to have remission of pain or guilt, are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."*

* These doctrines of the Church of Rome we find fully and broadly stated in the following decrees and canons:

I. WORSHIP OF THE HOST.

"There remains no room to doubt but that all Christ's faithful

In a similar way, in regard to their use of wafers instead of bread, how easily we can trace

people should pay to this most holy sacrament in their veneration the worship of *Latreia*, *which is due to the true God*, according to the custom which the Catholic [Roman] Church has always received.”—*Concil. Trident.* Sess. xiii. c. v.

II. WORSHIPPING AND PROCESSIONS.

“If any shall say that in the holy sacrament of the eucharist the only begotten son of God is not to be adored, and that outwardly, with the worship of *Latreia*, and therefore that he ought neither to be venerated by any special festive celebration, nor carried solemnly about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of the Church, or that he ought not publicly to be exhibited to the people, that he may be worshipped, and that the worshippers of him are idolators,—let him be accursed.”—*Idem*, Canon vi.

III. ELEVATION OF THE HOST.

At the time of celebration, when the priest pronounces the words, “Take and eat ye all of this, for *THIS IS MY BODY*,”—the following direction is given :

“Here the priest *elevates* the host, whilst the people *adore*.”

And at the consecration of the chalice :

“Here also *adore*, when the priest *elevates* the chalice.”—

Canon of the Mass.

IV. MASSES FOR THE DEAD.

“The Lord being appeased by this offering, and granting grace and the gift of repentance, remits crimes and sins, even great ones ; for it is one and the same host, the same person now offering by the ministry of his priests, who then offered himself upon the cross, only in a different manner of offering....Wherefore, according to the tradition of the apostles, offering is duly made, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are alive, but also for the dead in Christ who are not yet wholly cleansed.”—*Concil. Trident.* Sess. xxii. c. ii.

it as a consequence of transubstantiation ; for any one believing that the bread was *transubstantiated*, would naturally look with horror and alarm at the idea of a crumb falling to the ground, or any the smallest particle being wasted or misused,—therefore the substitution of *a wafer*, in which there could be no crumbs. Against this also our Church protests, not in any article, but in one of the rubrics succeeding the Communion Service : “ And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.”

And, just in the same way as the superstitious use of the wafer would arise in one of the holy elements, so would a similar superstition arise in the other. The wine being transubstantiated into the actual blood of Christ, with what horror and alarm would they of necessity contemplate the spilling or the wasting of any portion of it. But there was nothing to substitute for the wine, as the wafer for the bread. There was no plan by which they could take away all possibility of accidents happening to the chalice. There was no device by which they could secure the wine from a thousand casualties, which might at any time arise in its distribution. Therefore failing in any substitution for it, they resolved to do away

with it altogether. They passed a decree by which, although the sacrament was to be *consecrated* in the two elements, yet only one of them was to be *administered*. That command which they saw visibly before them, "*Drink ye ALL of this,*" they presumed to violate by their human decisions; and thus grew up the strange anomaly of a Church maintaining one-half of the solemn precepts of the Saviour, and denying the other half; observing the institution as necessary to salvation on the ground of divine authority, yet depriving the institution of its completeness, unity, and characteristic significance, by their own presumptuous decisions, in the face of God's holy word.

It is this doctrine that is protested against in our thirtieth article: "The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people, for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christian men alike." It is to this doctrine that our present lecture will be directed, closing up and concluding all that is to be said on the subject of the sacramental ordinances.

I shall endeavour first to trace out before you *historically* the growth of this corruption, and I shall then endeavour secondly to show you the fallacy of those arguments upon which Rome defends it. But I must preface all that is to be said by the same remark as before, namely, the great

necessity of reverential feelings of humility and lowliness when we are thus compelled to speak of the mysteries of God's love. Let us pray that God may guide our minds aright, so that we may clearly perceive what is the truth, and boldly confess it: and yet withal have no breach of charity or kindly feeling towards those against whose errors we are now declaiming.

We can safely say, that for the first twelve centuries the holy eucharist was administered to the laity in both kinds. Cardinal Bona himself acknowledges that in the primitive Church it was universal. "It is very certain," he says, "that anciently all (both the clergy and laity) men and women received the holy mysteries in both kinds, when they were present at the solemn celebration of them. But out of the time of sacrifice, and out of the Church, it was customary always, and in all places, to communicate only in one kind. In the first part of this assertion all agree, both Catholics and sectaries; nor can any one deny it, that has the least knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs. For the faithful always, and in all places, from the very first foundation of the Church to the twelfth century, were accustomed to communicate under the species of bread and wine; but in the beginning of that century, the use of the cup began by little and little to be laid aside; and many bishops interdicted the people the use of the cup, for fear of irreverence and effusion."*

* Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 18.

This fear then of irreverence and effusion making progress along with the progress of transubstantiation, first vented itself in the device of imparting the wine to the laity by means of quills or straws. This not quite succeeding, another device was adopted, of mingling the two elements together, by dipping the bread into the wine, and thus communicating in both kinds at once. But even this did not pass unnoticed. Pope Urban II, in the Council of Clermont, made an express decree against it, suffering it only to be done in cases of the sick, but decreeing the use of the bread and wine separately wherever it could be done. "No one shall communicate without receiving the body and the blood *separately*, except through necessity and precaution."* This was in the eleventh century.

Shortly after this we find that the custom of mingling the bread and wine together prevailed to a great extent in our own country. Arnulphus, bishop of Rochester, wrote in defence of it. One Lambert proposed a question to the bishop: "Why the eucharist should be administered in both kinds at once, contrary to the command of Christ and the primitive practice?" to which Arnulphus replied, that it was one of those things which were indifferent; and that although anciently the two species of bread and wine were given separately, yet now they might

* Concil. Clermont. Can. xxviii.

be given together, lest any ill accidents should happen in the distribution of the wine alone, and lest it should stick to the hairs of the beard or whiskers, or be spilt by the minister.”*

Going on to the next century—about the year 1280—we find this doctrine still advancing. In England, Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, expressly forbade the use of the cup. In a synod held at Lambeth, the clergy are admonished to withhold the chalice from the more ignorant sort of the laity, and to inform them that the integrity of the sacrament is contained under the single species of bread; for “the blood of our blessed Lord,” the canon goes on to say, “is allowed only to the priest that celebrates, in the lesser churches.”† Here by the expression *lesser churches*, we find the principle upon which the introduction was made. In the cathedral and conventual churches, and in the universities, both kinds were still administered, because there the learning and the knowledge of the laity, would have been sufficient to resist the innovation; but the new doctrine was to be advanced among the simpler and more ignorant sort, their ignorance causing them more readily to acquiesce in the exactions of the clergy. Thus things went on until the fifteenth century, when we come to the Council of Constance; but at this period we find

* Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. b. xv. c. 5. † Collier, b. v. cent. xiii.

many instances of communion in both kinds still preserved, and many attempts to retain it against the encroachments of the clergy, down to the Council of Trent. In Bohemia, Hungary, Austria, and France, petitions and remonstrances were presented on all sides to be allowed its retention. The Austrians demanded it of Ferdinand, and the Bavarians of their prince; the Poles and the French demanded it in the name of their respective nations :* and in fact on all sides, there never was a question which seemed to agitate the minds of religious persons to such an extent, as this encroachment of the Church of Rome. Still with a deaf and stubborn ear, the Church of Rome in her pride and tyranny went on. At Constance, we find the first open and public decree forbidding the Sacrament to be administered in two kinds :—before that council it had been left open, one pope deciding this way and another that way ; but at Constance, in the year 1415, it was publicly forbidden as a decree of the Church, in the following terms :—“ Whereas in some parts of the world, certain persons rashly presume to assert, that the Christian people ought to receive the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds of bread and wine, and do everywhere communicate the laity, not only in the bread, but also in the wine. . . . this present holy general

* Sarpi, *Histoire du Concile de Trente* ; and L'Enfant, *Histoire du Concile de Basle*.

council. . . . after much and mature deliberation had of many, who are learned both in divine and human law, declares, decrees, and determines, that *although in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful in both kinds*, yet for the avoiding of any dangers and scandals, the custom has reasonably been introduced that it be received by the officiating persons in both kinds, but by the laity only under the kind of bread ; since it is to be believed most firmly, and in nowise to be doubted, that the whole body and blood of Christ is truly contained as well under the species of bread, as under that of wine.”* And the synod then goes on in the next paragraph to state, that those “ Clergy shall be excommunicated, who presume to teach that the Communion ought to be received in both kinds.”

And thus we advance to the sixteenth century,—the Council of Trent,—which thus decrees, setting forth reasons and arguments upon which the denial of the cup is particularly maintained. In the twenty-first session, we find as follows : “ It cannot by any means be doubted, but that the Communion of either kind is sufficient for salvation ; for although the Lord Christ at his last supper, instituted and delivered to his apostles this venerable Sacrament in the species of bread and wine, yet that institution and delivery do not

* Conc. Constan. Sess. xiii.

aim at this, that all the faithful in Christ be bound by the Lord's decree to receive both kinds." And it then goes on to furnish places of Scripture by which they would defend themselves;* and continues in the second chapter thus: "Wherefore the holy Mother Church, recognizing this power (the power of making alterations, saving the *substance* of the Sacraments) in the administration of the Sacraments, although the use of both kinds was not uncommon from the beginning of the Christian religion, yet in process of time, that custom being very extensively altered, and she being moved with grace and just reasons, has approved this custom of communicating under one kind, and has appointed it to be accounted as a law, which it is not lawful to find fault with or alter, without the authority of the Church herself." Canons then follow in the usual way, by which any priest violating this law, or any person speaking against their decision, is placed under anathema: "If any shall say that the holy [Roman] Catholic Church was not led by just causes and reasons to communicate the laity, and also the clergy who do not celebrate the service, under the kind of bread *only*, let him be accursed."†

Here, then, we have the whole history of this innovation. It is altogether contained in that period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries—three centuries perhaps of the darkest and most

* See pp. 152-3. † Concil. Trident, Sess. xxi. cap. 1. can. i. ii. &c.

debased of the history of the world. Since that time it has been continued stedfastly as a doctrine of the Romanist Church. It is defended by Canasius, Suarez, Bellarmine, and other writers of the Roman school; nay, it is maintained, practised, and taught, up to this very hour:—no Romanist ever being blessed (it never enters into his imagination that he can be blessed) by the reception of the cup of his Redeemer. For this we have only to look to their catechism and authorised books of instruction of the present day. For instance, in the *Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine* we find it thus drawing a distinction between the communion of the priest and the laity: “*Q.* Why are the priests obliged to receive under both kinds? *A.* Because they offer sacrifice, and represent the bloody sacrifice made upon the cross, where the blood was actually divided from the body, and being offerers of the sacrifice, are bound to receive also the cup, by Christ’s command expressed. *Q.* Did the laity ever communicate in both kinds? *A.* They did sometimes in the primitive Church, and may again, if the holy Church shall so appoint; but now it is prohibited by the Church;” and here follow the *reasons*: “to prevent the danger of shedding the cup. Neither are the laity in this defrauded of anything, for they receive whole Christ under one kind, which is [now comes one of their usual sneers against the Catholic Church], which is incompara-

bly more than the pretended Reformers have under both, who receive only a bit of *baker's bread*, with a cup of common *vintner's wine*.”* And in the same manner in another modern catechism, extensively circulated in Ireland, entitled *Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine*, you find it thus: “We profess that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament. Q. But does not Christ say, Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you? A. True; but according to the [Roman] Catholic doctrine, we do this, although we receive under one kind alone, because under either kind we receive both the body and the blood of Christ. Q. But are not all Christians commanded to drink of the cup,—‘Drink ye ALL of it?’ A. No: that command was only addressed to the twelve apostles, who were all that were then present.” In these passages, then, we find the doctrine as still taught, and the reasons alleged. It is neither denied, regretted, nor concealed; but while Scripture itself is brought forward with boldness, it is only brought forward to show that the Church has more authority than the Scripture. Primitive custom is also brought forward and openly acknowledged as against them, yet primitive custom is unscrupulously set aside. Both against Scripture and against antiquity, the Church of Rome

* Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, *Dublin*, 1840, p. 83.

will persevere,—not the Church Catholic, but the Church of *Rome*, which resolves itself into nothing more or less than this. The Church of Rome for the time being,—the Church of Rome as deciding for itself in council or by pope,—is of more authority, and more to be heard, than even Scripture or the voice of Catholic consent.*

But we must now proceed to our second consideration, which was this : To examine the arguments and reasons suggested by Rome in her own defence. She would not of course assert so remarkable a doctrine as this, and withstand so great a host of opponents as have risen up against her, without *some* arguments on which to take her stand. What are these arguments? They resolve themselves into these two principal heads : 1. Texts of Scripture, in which it is made to appear that our Saviour sanctioned, and the apostles practised, a communion in the bread alone. And 2. The fact of the institution itself of the cup, and the expression, “Drink ye all of it,” being addressed only to the apostles, as *priests*.

I. The principal texts by which the denial of the cup to the laity is justified, are the following ; in which mention is made of “*eating*,” and of the “*flesh*,” or the “*bread*,” without the correspond-

* Rome assumes the doctrine, that the spirit and efficacy of the sacrament is conveyed by the bread alone; and then declaring that the Church has power to dispense with all that is not essential to its spirit and efficacy, does dispense with it. The point of our difference is not in the conclusion, but in the premiss.

ing action of "*drinking*," or "the *blood*." St. John vi. 51, 57, 58: "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "He that eateth me, the same shall also live by me." "He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever."* Now putting aside the question whether the sixth chapter of St. John does really refer to the eucharist, yet how very remarkable it is that they should pick out these three verses wherein the "bread" or "flesh" is certainly mentioned separately, and yet omit all the intervening verses, where the bread or flesh are joined together with the blood, as in verse 53: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, *and drink his blood*, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, *and drinketh my blood*, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, *and my blood* is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, *and drinketh my blood*, dwelleth in me, and I in him." Now certainly any person that would bring forward two or three places where the one part, *eating*, is certainly described alone, and found upon that an argument that bread alone is required in the eucharist, and yet neglect to inform us of the context, in which there are much stronger expressions as to the parallel part of "*drinking*," in conjunction,—would be considered guilty of unfairness in argument. But

* These are the texts brought forward by Gother, in Chalmers's abridgment of "A Papist misrepresented," *Edinburgh*, 1836, p. 68; and referred to by the Council of Trent.

what is the fact? The whole passage refers to a comparison between the bodily wants of human nature, and the spiritual wants. And as we know that in the body there is required, not only food for eating, but for drinking also,—not only hunger to be satisfied, but thirst also,—so, if anything is to be inferred from this passage of St. John, it is most assuredly *against* the Romanist doctrine, and not in its favour; for to complete the spiritual nourishment in the sacrament, the blood must be received as well as the body,—just as in the bodily nourishment, death will follow from the want of a satisfying of the thirst, although food for the satisfying of the hunger be ever so abundant. And this our Lord himself says: “For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.”

In a corresponding temper with this, they assert the Scriptures to favour communion in one kind;—by the “bread” being mentioned alone in the account of our Lord with the disciples at Emmaus, wherein St. Luke says: “He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them.” And in a similar manner, in the Acts of the Apostles, the three thousand are described as continuing stedfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and “in *breaking of bread*,” and on another occasion, the disciples are described as “assembled together to *break bread*.”* First, as to those

* Another argument from Scripture, which I think hardly

places where "*breaking bread*" is used in the Acts of the Apostles, and by St. Luke. It is well known by any one acquainted with Church history, that "*breaking bread*" became, by general usage, a phrase or title descriptive of the whole sacrament. It was not considered as applying to one of the elements; but it was, like that of "communion" or "eucharist," a general, descriptive title. But this being set aside, let us take the words as they actually appear, and compare them with the first epistle to the Corinthians. (i. 33.) We there find St. Paul directing thus: "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together *to eat*, tarry one for another." By their own argument, since the word "*eating*" is alone mentioned in this place, the Corinthians did not drink wine at that holy feast to which St. Paul alludes. And again, in verse 34: "If any man *hunger*, let

worth notice in the text, is advanced by the Romanists from the passage in St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 27) where the Greek might be translated, "Whosoever shall eat this bread *or* (η) drink this blood;" from this they argue that either of the two component parts of the sacrament, eating bread *or* drinking wine, will be sufficient. Certainly the particle η used in this place is generally disjunctive; but it is also very frequently conjunctive. Compare Luke xx. 2 (η) with Matt. xxi. 23 ($\kappa\alpha\iota$). Besides this, in the account before us by St. Paul, two verses afterwards (verse 29) he says himself: "*\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\iota\nu\omega\nu*," "*and drinking*," so that this argument is at once destroyed. The Alexandrian, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, all translate as we do: "Whosoever shall eat this bread *and* drink this cup."

him *eat* at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation." By the mention of the word *hunger* alone, by parity of reasoning, there could have been no use of wine in that holy feast to which St. Paul alludes. But what was the case? When we examine what the fault was for which St. Paul censures the Corinthians in this place, we find it just the contrary. In verse 20 it is said: "When ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper, for in eating every one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry, and another is DRUNKEN." Here, therefore, is an absurdity; and it is shown that although *eating* alone is mentioned, yet the wine was also there.

No. Every one of common fairness must acknowledge that this is a mere phrase of language. One portion of a thing is taken, according to a well-known figure in writing, as descriptive of the whole.

II. But secondly, one of their great arguments in favour of the innovation is this;—the persons to whom alone the words of institution were given were *priests*;—they were our Lord's chosen apostles, and stood as representatives only of the *priesthood*; therefore the cup being given to *them* does not by any means infer that it was to be given to the laity. Be it so. But is it not obvious immediately to any person, even of the commonest understanding, that if the argument is

sound as applying to the cup, it is also sound as applying to the bread ; and that therefore, for the very same reason, they do wrong in communicating the laity even in the bread. Nay, the whole institution is gone altogether,—there is no sacrament at all ; for in that case it was a mere institution, like holy orders, applicable only to the priesthood. But waiving this,—the apostles were *not* priests at the time of the institution. They had been appointed as the teachers and companions of Christ *preparatory* to the priesthood. They had not yet received their full commission, nor did they until just before the ascension, when our Lord “breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” when they were sent forth to “baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” When, therefore, the institution of the Lord’s Supper was commanded, the apostles stood there as representatives, not of the clergy only, but of the whole Church. It was not a specific command, as “Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them,” or, “Preach the Gospel to every creature,” or, “Whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained ;” but it was to men representing Christianity at large.

The command, “Drink ye all of this,” referred to all the world. We show it immediately by this dilemma. Either they were priests, or they were not priests. If they were not priests, then

the command applies to every Christian, and every Christian is bound to receive the cup as well as the bread. If they *were* priests, then the whole sacrament has nothing whatever to do with the laity; and for the laity to communicate, even in the bread, is a vital infringement of God's holy word. Whichever branch of this dilemma the Romanist may take, he will find his present manner of administering the holy communion erroneous and anti-scriptural.

But we may not only advance these arguments as in defence. We may retort upon them, and show most conclusively from Scripture that *wine* did form a necessary constituent part of the eucharistic feast,—wine not only consecrated by the priesthood, but also *administered to the laity*. And this from the very same chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians before adduced. Let us look to that chapter again. Examine it fairly, and you will find the apostle addressing men as for some fault committed in the administration of the Lord's Supper. Examine what that fault was, and you will find it to be a partaking of the *wine*,—not only of the bread, but of the *wine*,—unworthily; and in the course of the rebuke which the apostle administers to them, he takes occasion to recite the words of institution. He finds no fault with them for the fact of “*drinking the wine*,” but for an *abuse* in drinking the wine; and then he recites the words of institution: “For I have

received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood. This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." Here then the words of institution are brought forward as an argument against the Corinthians' abuse of the wine in the Holy Supper. They had not drunk the wine in *remembrance of Christ*, as Christ had commanded them;—therefore, Christ *had* commanded them,—them, the Corinthians,—them, the laity. Surely this would have been the place for the apostle St. Paul, many years after the institution had been in common use, to remark upon their error as laymen in violating that which was the privilege of the clergy, if it had been such a privilege. The inference is infallibly deducible, that the *chalice* as well as the *bread* was to constitute, and did constitute, the holy supper of the Lord.

So much then for the arguments from Scripture. As to antiquity, as I have already shown you in the quotations from Cardinal Bona and the council of Clermont, they have no authority whatever;*

* Cassander also acknowledges it. Speaking of the demand so continually made, about the time of the council of Trent, for

their only defence being the fact that in the early times the holy eucharist was administered to the sick, or to children, or to the faithful in times of persecution, in one kind,—the cup being omitted. This we acknowledge; but the very fact of its so being administered to those classes of persons, shows evidently that it was the exception, and not the rule. What we are now speaking of, is the general and universal practice of public communion. And in this every age abounds in witnesses.

First. In the time of St. Cyprian (A.D. 250), a certain sect desired to receive the communion in water only, and not in wine; upon which St. Cyprian wrote a letter to Cecilius, in which he speaks thus: "Since certain persons, either ignorantly or out of simplicity, in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and *administering it to his people*, do not that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the author and teacher of this sacrifice, did and taught, I have thought it right and necessary to send this letter to you, that if any man remains in that error, he may be brought back to the root and original institution of our Lord's tradition. *The*

the restoration of the cup, he says. "Wherefore not without cause are most of the best Catholics, and those most conversant in the reading of ecclesiastical writers, inflamed with an earnest desire of obtaining the cup of the Lord, that the sacrament may be brought back to that ancient custom and use which hath been for many ages perpetuated in the universal Church."—Cited by Bishop Hall.

*cup of the Lord is always thirsted after, and drunk in the Church.”**

2. Again, we have another instance in the Manichæans, a sect of Christians in the time of Leo the First, about the year 450. They scrupulously abstained from wine; and yet they would join themselves in the communion of the eucharist, and pretended to receive it without the cup. Upon which Leo, bishop of Rome, pronounces them heretical, and says: “The Manichæans withdraw themselves from the sacrament of human salvation; but when, to conceal their infidelity, they presume to be ^{*}present at our mysteries, they receive the body with an unworthy mouth, but they decline altogether to drink of the blood of our redemption.”†

3. Shortly after, we find another sect, in the time of Gelasius, bishop of Rome, in the year 490. Out of some superstitious fancy, they thought fit to abstain from the consecrated chalice. Upon this, Gelasius writes thus: “We find that certain persons, when they have received their portion of the sacred body, abstain from the cup of the holy blood. Let these men beyond doubt (since I know not by what superstition they can be hindered) either receive the sacrament entire, or abstain from it altogether, because there

* Cyprian. Epist. ad Cæcilium, edit. Wirceb. i. 185.

† Leo, Sermon iv. in Quadrages. Bibl. Patr. Colon. 1618, vol. v. part ii.

cannot be *a division of one and the same mystery, without great sacrilege.*”*

4. Again, we have a fourth instance in the time of Julius, bishop of Rome, in the year 920. Some persons had introduced the plan of communicating with the bread dipped in the wine,—upon which Julius writes as follows: “We have heard that certain persons, filled with a schismatical ambition against the divine decrees and the apostolical institutions, have offered the eucharist to the people dipped in the wine, by way of full communion; but that this is contrary to the apostolical doctrine, and contrary to the custom of the Church, it is not difficult to prove from the very fountain of truth from which the mysteries of the sacraments themselves have come; for the setting forth *of the bread and the wine separately* is recorded,—and therefore every such error ought immediately to cease.”†

Here then we have four distinct instances of attempts, from various causes, on the part of the laity, to withdraw themselves from the communion of the cup; but in each instance, the attempt pronounced heretical and superstitious. In those days, it was not the clergy that deprived the people,—but the clergy that pronounced the people

* Gelasius, Ep. ad Majoric. et Joan. Decret. iii.; De Consecr. P. Dist. ii. § xii.

† Julius, Ep. ad Episc. Ægypt. Decret. iii.; P. De Consecr. Dist. ii. § vii.

heretical, if they presumed to deprive *themselves*. They were pronounced heretical,—as mutilating and corrupting the word of God,—as destroying the whole essence and virtue of a sacrament, by thus dividing it. And all this is abundantly confirmed by farther testimony, as follows :

Ignatius says (A.D. 100) :

“There is one bread broken to all, and one chalice distributed to all.”*

Ambrose says (A.D. 370) :

“He is unworthy of the Lord, who presumes to celebrate the mystery otherwise than it was delivered by him. For he cannot be a devoted servant, who presumes to do otherwise than was commanded by its author.”†

Chrysostom says (A.D. 390) :

“It is not now as it was in the Old Testament, where the priest ate one portion, the prince another, and it was not lawful for the people to have a share in that which belonged to the priest ;—but there is one body, and *one cup, offered to all.*”‡

Nay, even so far onwards as *Alexander of Hales* (A.D. 1230): “This sacrament being worthily received *in both kinds*, there is a greater effect of one mystical body with the head, than if it were received in one kind.”§

* Epist. ad Philadelph.

† Ambros. in 1 Cor. xi.

‡ Chrysost. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor.

§ Alex. Hales, Quæst. xxxii. Mem. i. Art. 2, 1516, tom. iv. p. 123.

Thus, therefore, our proof is established from antiquity. And what more can be said? It is in vain that they cry out, we give you all that can be required. It is in vain that they say, that the essence and virtue of the sacrament are contained under one kind as well as under two; and that the blood of Christ cannot be separate from the body, and therefore in receiving the body, you receive within it the blood. All this is vain; a trivial subtilty of the schoolmen, and unworthy the enlightened understanding of Christian divines. No, my brethren. Of all the corruptions of Rome, less can be said in defence of this than of any other. The advantage that can be conceived possible from its practice more unintelligible,—the injury that is inflicted upon God's word greater,—the deprivation on the part of the laity more unjust,—the elevation of the priesthood more open and more shameless. Why mutilate God's holy word? Why do violence to all antiquity? Why subject themselves to unworthy subterfuges and dishonest artifices, to defend themselves in a practice which they feel within themselves and know to be all the while utterly incapable of defence?

My brethren, if there is anything that you have need to rejoice in as connected with your privileges in the membership of a pure and apostolic Church, it is surely this;—if there is anything in which you have need to compassionate the members of the Church of Rome, it surely is this—that while

they never are permitted to use the sacrament of the eucharist but in an incomplete, corrupt, and divided form, it is put before *you* in all the simplicity, pureness, and entireness of the apostolic days. Can any one understand what a *sacrifice* is, what an *atonement* is, and yet imagine that it can be efficacious without *blood*? Does not all Scripture, both in the Old Testament and the New, assert that “without sprinkling of blood there is no remission of sins?” True in the notion of a sacrifice, the body of the victim was made a feast or banquet, upon which the offerers of the sacrifice did feed: but also, and concomitantly was it true, that the *blood* was poured out, and sprinkled upon everything that was desired to be made holy; upon the altar, upon the tabernacle, upon the priests’ vestments, upon the priests themselves, and also upon the people,* whenever those people needed a cleansing, or a purification, or a fresh dedication of themselves before God; and in that holy sacrament of the New Testament which was expressly devised as the great memorial of the antitype of all sacrifice, shall it not be the same? Shall we have only one part? Shall we leave out all that so beautifully depicts to the mind THE ATONEMENT,—all that is to sprinkle our hearts and souls with the blood of the Redeemer,—all that so specifically and notoriously repre-

* See Leviticus i. 11; iv. 6; Numb. xix. 4; Exod. xxiv. 6, 8, &c. &c.

sents and conveys to us the Lamb of God, who *shed his blood*, as well as gave his body to be broken? If Christ appointed two symbols, two elements, two vehicles of his grace, are not they both essential to the sacrament. They do not signify either of them separately what both do conjointly : that is evident, otherwise Christ would not have commanded both. The breaking of the body does not signify the effusion of the blood, nor does the effusion of the blood signify the breaking of the body. To say that one of them is superfluous, is to charge God with commanding a thing unnecessary. The ancient fathers went so far as to give the name of sacrament to each ;* so essential did they imagine each to be as a matter of sacramental salvation. Awful indeed is the responsibility of that Church, which denies that which God has given, curtails that which God has made ample, or confines to a few unjustly privileged that which is continually sounding in their ears, in the words of our blessed Saviour, “ Drink ye *ALL* of this, for this is my blood shed for many, for the remission of sins.”

Adhere then strictly, and with FAITH ;—adhere with all love, and never-ceasing gratitude, to that holy Catholic Church in which Almighty God by his providence has placed you. Contrast the two Churches together, in the several parts of the holy sacrament of the eucharist. Consider what the one withholds, and the other offers ;—what the

* See note, p. 130, Sermon vi.

one exacts, and the other proposes. The one exacts your faith in a repeated and corporeal sacrifice of the Redeemer on the cross,—exacts your faith in a transubstantiation of the bread and wine into his actual body and his actual blood,—exacts your worship and adoration of those holy elements so supposed to be transmuted, and your acknowledgment that these things done by a priest have efficacy in purchasing your indulgence in a purgatorial fire ;—but she withholds from you a performance of that holy rite in a language understood by you,—she withholds from you that spiritual communion in the sacrifice, which alone God, being a spirit, can value,—and, above all, she withholds any participation in that precious blood-shedding represented in the commemoration by the *cup*, which Jesus gave to all. While the *other*—praise be to God !—offers you all that has spirit and truth, without the exaggerations of corruption,—all that has devotion and love, without the innovations of superstition. She offers you a sacrifice,—but a *pure* sacrifice,—a real sacrifice of your alms, your souls and bodies, and your oblations ;—a *spiritual* sacrifice, in your praises and your prayers ;—a *commemorative* sacrifice, in remembrance of the one atonement made for the sins of the whole world. She offers you a real presence in the body and blood of your Redeemer,—but real in the sense of a *spiritual*, not a corporeal transubstantiation contradictory to your

senses. She offers you a communion, not a hearing;—a language you can understand, not an unintelligible sound;—the worship of your God, not the adoration of a host. She offers you, *above all*, that holy chalice which Jesus Christ offered you, and which the Church from time out of mind ever offered to her communicants, until Rome, in an evil hour,—evil for herself, and evil for the world,—made it the sole privilege of her priesthood, instead of the general blessing of her people.

SERMON XIV.

EXODUS xx. 4, 5.

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth : Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them.”

WE are now to approach the third leading division of the errors of the Church of Rome. In the first we considered the general ground-work or rule of faith : in the second the sacramental ordinances. In that which is now to follow we shall have to consider the OBJECTS OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP ; —and strange to say, great and fearful as have been the errors which have already passed before us, those which remain are even more fearful still, because they trench upon the actual personal dignity of that Divine Being, who, lest we should ever forget the honour due unto His Name, has represented himself to us in his Scriptures as a “jealous God.”

I have continually stated that the principle upon which all Romish error is based in that of *addi-*

tion ; and this principle you will find more peculiarly exemplified in the present division of the subject than in any other. Scripture and the Church of Christ have universally determined that there can only be one object of divine worship,—that is, God ; only one Being *to whom* prayers are to be addressed,—only one Mediator *through whom* prayers are to be addressed,—and one only source *from whom* all the strength, help, direction, and comfort, upon which depend the hopes and aspirations of the human race, are to spring. But the Church of Rome has pronounced it to be a doctrine of the faith, and has made it a constant practice among her people, that not only is there One God to be worshipped, but also that there are other either secondary or parallel objects of worship,—namely, holy relics and images, saints and angels, and, in a peculiar manner, the Virgin Mary.

Again, the Scripture and the Church of Christ have universally declared, that there can only be one sort of worship which men can offer. They do not enter into any niceties of distinction, saying that we can have a higher worship for one Being, and yet retain a lower worship for other secondary beings,—but they simply state that praises and prayers, trust, adoration, bowing down, serving, or whatever other words we may use to denominate *worship*,—can only be of one character, as demanded only of one Being, who claims of us

the whole of our spiritual affections and love ;—whereas Rome, to match the several orders of objects which she directs her people to adore, has invented several orders of worship. There is one sort of worship which is due to the Deity, another sort due to the Virgin Mary, and still another sort due to saints, angels, images and relics ; and thus she has introduced a miserable confusion and multiplicity into that which the Scriptures have described as simple and single. But how do they apply this worship ? In this way : For the three persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, they propose a worship called "*Latreia*," which is a word derived from the Greek—*λατρευω*—found in the Septuagint translation of the Bible, signifying "*to serve*," and for the lower objects, such as images and relics, they propose another sort of worship, called "*Duleia*," which is derived from a Greek word—*δουλεω*—also used in the Septuagint, signifying "*to serve*,"—and thirdly for the Virgin Mary, as being somewhat above images or saints, and yet below the Divine Being himself, she has invented a third and intermediate degree of worship, called *Hyper-Duleia*. As to the meaning of the words *Latreia* and *Duleia*, there can be no real distinction, for we find them both equally used in the Septuagint translation, as applied, 1st, to the service which we pay to God ; 2ndly, to the false service which heathens paid to their idols ; and 3rdly, to the service which men pay to one ano-

ther. In all these senses, the two words are used indiscriminately; and being translations of the same Hebrew word, they must in the Scripture signify the same thing; and therefore there can be no real distinction between them. The distinction is imaginary, and is made use of by Rome to represent, according to *their own theory*, and not according to the *Scripture command*, some sort of difference in the veneration paid to different objects, so as not to appear altogether and too openly lovers or practisers of idolatry. But even yet, after they have invented these words to signify their different degrees of worship, they wander into endless confusion in applying them. Their divines never agree as to which of them should be applied, or which not applied, to relics, or to the saints, or images, or angels,—some asserting one thing, and some another,—bringing different shades of meaning, and different senses in their application; so that, after all, nothing is gained. On the contrary, as must ever be the case when we leave God's commandments for the devices of men, nothing but uncertainty and error can be the result.*

* Perceiving the absurdity of offering spiritual worship to a senseless stock or stone, they assert that the worship is given, not to the stock or stone *per se*, but to the image,—*i. e.* not to the material, but to the carved workmanship, as conveying to the mind the recollection of the original. While some writers would therefore say that the image of Christ so reflecting the

But of these difficulties in the application of their three sorts of worship, we shall have to speak as our subject proceeds. For the present, let it suffice that you have a clear understanding of the names which they have given to them,—Latreia, Duleia, and Hyper-Duleia. I shall now proceed in the present lecture to speak of those objects of veneration which Rome holds forth to her people, in addition to the worship of God,—beginning at those which may be considered the very lowest,—namely, things inanimate—holy relics and holy images. I shall then go on to those objects which are certainly one degree higher, as containing life and immortality,—as saints and angels. And then lastly I shall proceed to that peculiar object of worship, which she keeps distinct from all others,—namely, the Virgin Mary. And may the Almighty God, whom alone we worship through His Son Jesus Christ, preserve us, both in hearing and speaking, without compromise, in a due detestation of those corruptions which Rome has in this matter so unhappily introduced.

I. And first, of RELICS. There seems a propen-

original is worthy of Latreia, others would say that the image is not the thing worthy, but Christ, the worship only passing *through the image*; but others again would make a subdivision of the matter, and say that Latreia *proper* is due to Christ, but Latreia *improper* to the image, and so forth. The confusion is endless. What must be the result in ignorant minds, it is easy to perceive.

sity inherent in our very nature to value the possession of any remains of persons whom we have once loved, or who have been eminent or conspicuous in the world. We all know that articles of property, not in themselves valuable, obtain a value extrinsic to themselves from the mere fact of their once belonging to our friends or relations, or those whom we have had any special reason to honour. This natural principle was particularly shown in the history of the early Christians. Those who were most eminent among them for faith and courage were sure to fall under the persecuting hand of their heathen enemies. In the early ages martyrdom abounded, and it was a right and holy custom for Christians carefully to attend the bodies of those who died in the fellowship of Christ, sealing their faith by their blood. This they always did, secretly or openly. They would gather round the tombs of the martyrs, and hallow the place of their martyrdom by meeting at certain times for prayer and worship. They would place their bodies under holy altars, and consecrate them to God ; and whenever the arm of persecution might be stayed, they would rejoice to build churches, in which they would deposit these holy relics, and so retain their memory among them, as the faithful servants of the Lord. And from this custom, innocent and laudable in itself, it is easy to imagine, when superstition began to arise within the Church, how soon a fictitious value

might be set upon the possession of any of these remains so preserved. It was but a step from hallowing and consecrating the remains of the martyrs with this affectionate observance, to worship them with religious veneration. This step was taken. From the remains of the *martyrs* the idea spread to the remains of our Lord and his apostles, and to the Virgin Mary; and not only to the body of our Lord, but to all the instruments used in the crucifixion and resurrection,—such as the nails, the spear, the reed, the scourge, the cross, the napkin, and the like; and so superstition would advance, and these different relics would be enshrined in the churches, and considered as charms for the preservation of soul and body, remedies for disease, and defences against evil; and then by a farther step these relics might be given away from one person to another, or might be sold to such persons as might desire privately to possess them, and altogether would grow up an idolatrous veneration, fed by the superstition of the age, for any of the remains of the saints of old,—a superstition which those saints themselves, had they been alive, would have been the first to repudiate with horror and aversion.

But have we any right thus to fasten upon the Church of Rome an idolatrous veneration of relics by this mere *assertion*? It is not a mere assertion. We shall find abundant proofs throughout their history. First. In the second Nicene council

(A.D. 787), we find a decree setting forth the necessity of having holy relics in every church, thus : “ We decree that whatever venerable churches have been consecrated without holy relics of martyrs, shall have a deposit of relics made in them, with the accustomed prayer. And if after the present time, any bishop shall be found consecrating a church without holy relics, let him be deposed as one that transgresseth ecclesiastical tradition.”* There is certainly no positive adoration mentioned here, but there is, by a public decree, a superstitious value set upon relics, by which the people were likely to be misled ; and by which in fact they were misled, as history abundantly informs us. But let us go on to the Council of Trent. This council broadly asserts as follows : “ That the holy bodies of the holy martyrs, and others living with Christ, which were living members of Christ and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and are by Him to be raised to eternal life and glorified, ought to be *venerated* by the faithful ; by means of which the faithful receive many benefits : so that they who declare that *veneration and honour* are not due to the relics of the saints, or that the *honour* which the faithful pay to them and other sacred monuments is useless. are utterly to be condemned, as the Church already has condemned them, and does so at the present time.”† And the creed of Pope

* Conc. Nic. II. Canon vii. † Conc. Trident. Session xxv.

Pius follows, thus: "The saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invoked; and they offer prayers to God for us; and *their relics* are to be held in veneration." You will observe that the words in these public documents are very carefully chosen—*honour* and *veneration*. It is *possible* certainly to conceive these two emotions of the mind to exist without positive falling down and worshipping; but any candid person would say, that there would be a very slight distinction, even among the acutest and most cultivated mind; and certainly there would be no distinction in the eyes of a poor and uneducated person. But the real question is, whether or no one of the two sorts of worship, *Latreia* or *Duleia*, is intended in the words, *honour* and *veneration*. We are prepared most decidedly to show that one of these sorts of worship must have been intended, both from the private writers of the Church of Rome, and from their practices. For instance, Azorius, a Romanist writer subsequent to the Council of Trent, speaking of the worship due to the cross, asks this question: "Whether the nails, spear, scourges, sponge, and crown of thorns, made of any materials, ought to be worshipped with *Latreia*?" You observe *Latreia*—the highest sort of worship. To which St. Thomas replies, that "A cross of any material ought to be worshipped with *Latreia*, because not only the cross on which Jesus Christ hung is wor-

thy of that worship because it touched Christ, but also inasmuch as it is a cross, that is a sign and image of Christ *hanging* on the cross. But the other instruments of our Lord's passion only deserve the worship of Latreia because they touched the body of Christ."* Here then we observe that the relics of the nails, spear, sponge, and such like things, are to be worshipped not only with *Duleia*, but positively with the highest sort of worship—*Latreia*, because they touched the body of Christ. In the same way another writer says: "Those things which by contact with our Lord partook of his holiness, and remained dignified even in the estimation of the faithful, as the cross, nails, spear, thorns, &c. these are to be adored with Latreia."† Another writer, Gretser, affirms it more broadly still; and he informs us not only that the relics ought to be worshipped, but he tells us where those relics are to be found: "The nails in various places,—the title of the cross at Rome and Toulouse,—the reed and the sponge at St. John Lateran,—the spear at Paris,—the coat without seam,—the purple robe," &c., &c.,—all these he goes through in order, stating where each of them may be found.‡ But still farther, we may come to more modern times at once. In Dens' *Theology*, a work at

* Azorius, Institut. Moral. tom. i. lib. ix. c. vi., as cited by Mr. Palmer in his eighth letter to Wiseman.

† Cabrera.

‡ Gretser de Cruce, tom. i. p. 169, &c.

present in use as a manual of the Romish teaching, we find the very same doctrine just as broadly stated: "Q. With what worship are relics honoured? A. In a mode and with a worship like that which the images of Christ and the saints are worshipped. with the same worship with which the person whose relics they are—a relative or respective worship We worship the cross, etc., inasmuch as they were the instruments of the victorious passion and exaltation, which were also sanctified by the contact of the body of Christ, or of the saints."*

Here then is abundantly sufficient to prove our point. Holy relics in the Church of Rome are actually made objects of worship. It is of no consequence to enter into their subtle niceties, of relative or respective worship, proper *Latreia* or improper *Latreia*; nor does it matter whether the worship be of a lower or of a higher degree. All this matters not. The veneration and honour commanded under anathema by the Council of Trent, does virtually amount, in the practical teaching of their divines, to a positive *adoration* of the relics; and any one who has been in foreign countries where the Church of Rome has power, knows what the effect is in the religion of the people. In our own country, where their Church is on the watch, and guarded, and where their people are considerably more enlightened by the

* Dens' Theology, vol. v. p. 45.

circumstances of their position than in foreign countries, such as Italy and Spain, we do not hear much about holy relics, but it is not the case in their general Church system. And let us always remember, that when we speak of Rome, we speak not of her with regard to individuals, nor do we speak of her in respect of the appearance which she can at times assume to allure the unwary, but we speak of her in reference to her general religious system ; and by that general religious system, and not by individual appearances, she must, in the eyes of all honest and impartial observers, stand or fall.

II. But we now approach the second object of religious worship which Rome has introduced—that of holy IMAGES—a worship of a kindred character, but, if possible, of a more gross and carnal description even than that of relics. That Christians living among heathens, and themselves in the early ages, in a very great majority, converts from heathenism, should be prone to retain those usages among them which they had before enjoyed, seems natural. They who had been used to set up before them, in every street, the statues of Jupiter and Mercury, would not, in their first and imperfect embracing of a new creed, be apt to look with any reluctance upon kindred statues of St. Paul or St. Peter, or even of Jesus Christ himself. It would fall in with their habits, would give no shock to their feelings ; and as yet imper-

fectly understanding the full spiritual meaning of Christianity, they would strive to help their devotions by a visible representation of those to whom their prayers might be poured forth. For the first three hundred years, however, no statues, images, or even pictures, were allowed on any condition to be set up within Christian churches. Attempts to do so were no doubt frequently made, because we find the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, especially decreeing against it: "It is our pleasure that there be no pictures in churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted on the walls."* Another testimony of its total absence as an allowed practice in the early ages, may be found in the case of Epiphanius. He mentions the fact of his accidentally going into a church in Palestine, and there finding a veil, dyed and painted, and hanging over the door of the church. Upon inspecting it, he found it to contain the image (as it were) of Christ, or of some saint. "When therefore I saw this," he continues, "when I saw, that contrary to the Scriptures, the image of a man was suspended in the Church of Christ, I cut it down, and gave counsel to the keepers of the place that they should use it for the burial of some poor man."† Now Epiphanius lived about the year 370, therefore, up to this period, we have a testi-

* Concil. Elib. Can. xxxvi. Labb. et Coss. tom. i. p. 974.

† Epiphanius, Epist. ad Joann. Hierosyl. in tom. iv. Oper. Hieronym. Bened. *Paris*, 1706.

mony that the setting up of any image or picture in a church, was not authorised among Christians. But it crept on by slow degrees. First, statues and paintings were used as matters of instruction, and particularly paintings: we know ourselves that some of the old painted windows of our cathedrals will convey a very considerable portion of religious instruction, in some cases a complete history of the transactions of the Old or New Testament History; and this was extremely necessary before the art of printing, when men had no other way of reading than by such devices. We find an allusion to this in the time of Gregory the Great. Images had been set up, and the people not adhering to that use of them which was intended, began to worship them, upon which Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, broke the images to pieces. Gregory wrote to the bishop, praising him for his zeal against the idolatry that had been practised, but blaming him for destroying the images, because they were *means of religious instruction*.* This happened towards the close of the sixth century, so that even up to this period we have a direct testimony from one of the most eminent of the popes of Rome, against the idolatrous use of images.† But after this period the

* Gregor. Epist. lib. ix. Ep. 9.

* Bingham, in his *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, confirms from various testimony the fact that up to the time of Gregory the Great, and even beyond it, there was considerable jealousy

use of image-worship spread with great rapidity. The great schism between the eastern and western Churches was produced by it. The Jews and Saracens were continually objecting to the Christians as idolaters, from this very circumstance. The Emperor Leo Isaurus on the one hand, published an edict to destroy and put them down. Gregory II, on the other, upheld them. Great contentions, and even wars followed, the pope anathematizing the emperor, and the emperor demanding a general council, so that the dispute

against the admission of anything graven, carved, or in any way representative in churches. "It is most certain from the writings of SS. Austin and Optatus, that there were no statues in that age in their churches or upon their altars, because they reckon both those to be mere heathenish customs; and Cassander observes the same out of the writings of Gregory the Great. He also notes that until the time of the sixth general Council, the images of Christ were not usually in the effigies or figure of a man, but only symbolically represented under the type of a lamb, and so the Holy Ghost was represented under the type or symbol of a dove. But the council forbade the picturing of Christ any more in the symbol of a lamb, and ordered it only to be drawn in the effigies of a man. I presume by this time the worship of images was begun A.D. 692. And it was now thought indecent to pay their devotions to a picture of a lamb, and therefore they would no longer endure it to be seen in a church."—*Bingham*, Eccles. Antiq. book viii. chap. viii. § 11. He also notes from Tertullian and others that so great was the abhorrence of the Christians against images as used for worship, that the profession of an image-maker was held as an abomination, and he that followed it was excluded from communion. See book xi. c. v. § vi., and book xvi. c. iv. § ii.

might be settled. At length a general council was held at Constantinople, attended by three hundred and eighty-eight bishops, in the year 754, in which the use and veneration of images was declared to be highly dangerous. They show it to be against God's word, and cite the Fathers of the Church as unanimously pronouncing against it. They speak particularly against the making of any image of Christ, because, He being God and man at the same time, they would be dividing his nature as representing him under a form descriptive of either separately : and they decree that no one, either "bishop, priest, or deacon, should either make an image, or worship it, or set it up in a church or private house." The effect of this council, however, was not of long duration, for Constantine Copronymus, under whose authority it had been summoned, being succeeded by Leo IV, and shortly afterwards the empire falling under the government of the Empress Irene, another council was summoned at Nicæa, in the year 786, which reversed the decision of the preceding council, and established the use of images by the following decree : "Moreover we salute the image of the honourable and life-giving cross, and the holy relics of the saints ; and we receive, and salute and embrace the holy and venerable imagesthat is to say, the image of the humanity of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of our immaculate Lady and holy Mother of God,

and the forms and representations of the holy and incorporeal angels in like manner of the divine apostles worthy of all praise, and of the inspired prophets, of the victorious martyrs, and of holy men." And afterwards the council goes on to declare the sort of honour or veneration which is to be paid to them, in these words: "Not indeed that true worship of faith which is due to God alone, but to make, in honour of them . . . the presentation of frankincense and lights;—for the honour rendered to the image is transmitted to the prototype, and he who worships the figure, worships the substance of that which is represented by it."*

After this the Church in the west took a different direction, and three hundred bishops assembled at Frankfort on the Maine, in the year 794, and they, having examined the controversy afresh, pronounced as decidedly *against* image-worship, as the Council of Nicæa had pronounced a few years before in its favour. And thus for many years the controversy was continued; and the opinions of the Church changing sides from year to year, until at length the people growing weary, and the opposition gradually declining, the practice was maintained and authorised throughout France, Germany, and other places. This was in the ninth century. In the sixteenth century we arrive at the Council of Trent, which

* Concil. Nic. II.

finally seals the matter, by pronouncing the following decree, which decree now remains as the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome until this day: "Moreover the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and other saints, are to be especially had and retained in the Churches, and due honour and veneration to be given them;" and then after disclaiming any notion of worshipping the images as God, that is with *Latreia*, it goes on thus: "So that by the images which *we kiss*, before which we *uncover our heads*, and *fall down*, we worship Christ, and venerate the saints, whose likeness they bear."

Here then, my brethren, I have endeavoured to place before you a short account of the rise and progress of image-worship. To enter into the full particulars of it, and to describe all the various turnings which the controversy took in the eighth and ninth centuries, would occupy more space than can well be spared in a lecture of this description: sufficient for us at present it will be to remember, that for the first three centuries, it was entirely unknown,—up to the sixth century, resisted by papal authority,—and even in the eighth century, continually a matter of controversy and dispute between different parts of Christendom:—now however, it stands a decided and constituent part of Romish doctrine. Whether it be the higher sort of worship, *Latreia*—or the lower sort, *Duleia*,—let me again repeat, it

will not signify. Sufficient for us, it is, that the Council of Trent has pronounced *some* sort of worship, honour, or veneration, to be due to holy images; and necessarily must it be, when men are taught to "*kiss* the holy images," to "*uncover their heads* before them," and to "*bow before them*," that in ignorant minds, worship must follow: not worship, as they say, which will pass on to the prototype (ignorant minds cannot make this distinction), but worship of the actual stock or stone which stands presently before them, shaped into some human form. And will they deny the Council of Trent? Do their present writers attempt to say anything contrary to that council? Dare they to say one word to invalidate its decrees? No: we have only to look into the works of any of those authors who have treated on the subject, to see that there is the very same doctrine going on among them, even to this hour. Palliations, excuses — attempts to explain away the actual worship of the image, by stating, that it is only placed before them to elevate the thoughts, and to encourage devotion—we shall continually find, but the fact always allowed and encouraged. The Romish writers present a double face: when defending themselves against the Church of England, they deny any worship as due to images, but merely represent them as useful memorials of religion, calling the mind to prayer. But when they speak

to their own people as exhorting them to religious duties, unbiassed by any reference to those who oppose them, they then furnish, without any ambiguity, a true picture of their doctrine. Thus, for instance, Bossuet, writing with a particular object, says as follows:—"When the Church pays an honour to the image of an apostle or martyr, the intention is not so much to honour the image, as to honour the apostle or martyr in the presence of the image."* And with the same view of softening down the offensiveness of the doctrine, you find the modern Catechisms speaking in like manner. They make a distinction between an idol and an image, and say that they may venerate images as mere representations, while they abominate idols; and when they expound the second Commandment, they translate the word *image* by "graven thing," and then put this question:—"What are we commanded by this precept? To serve, love, adore, and worship one only true, living, and eternal God, and no more." Then afterwards:—"What benefits do we receive by images? Very great: because they movingly *represent* to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, as also the martyrdoms and examples of his saints."† From this we should imagine that nothing more was meant by an image than a *representa-*

* Bossuet, Exposition.

† Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, as above, pp. 46-49. In reference altogether to the use or omission of the second commandment in their catechisms, there is the same duplicity. We

tion; it sounds well, because it is addressed to *us*, and has reference to *us*; but directly they are free from us and address their own people, then behold the difference. The whole question has a different aspect. For instance, Bellarmin says:—“To the images a certain inferior worship is due, and that not all one, but various according to the variety of images.”* And in another place more openly:—“The images of Christ and of the saints are to be venerated, not only by accident and improperly, but properly and by themselves; so that they themselves are the end of the veneration, they are considered *in themselves, and not only as representatives.*”† Again, Thomas Aquinas says:—“It is thus therefore said, that no reverence is due to the image of Christ in so far as it is any substance, any carved or painted wood, because reverence is only due to a rational nature. It remains then that reverence is shown

cannot charge them positively with a general omission of it, for in those catechisms which are in use in England, where they know the omission would be detected, we always find at least some mention of it. Sometimes it is abridged, and generally joined in with the first commandment; and this is done with reference to those *who know the Scriptures*. But in Italy, Spain, and similar countries, where the Scriptures are not known, their catechisms entirely omit the second commandment. Even Dr. Milner acknowledges only so far that “it appears in all our *most approved* catechisms,”—acknowledging thereby that it is omitted in some.

* Bellarmin. de Imagin. lib. ii. cap. xxv.

† Idem, c. xxi.

to the image only so far as it is an image, and then it follows that the same reverence is to be paid to the image of Christ as to Christ himself. Since therefore Christ is to be adored with the worship of *Latreia*, the consequence is that his image is to be adored with the worship of *Latreia*.* Again, Azorius says:—"It is the constant opinion of divines, that the image is to be adored with the same honour and worship as the original."† And Vasquez says:—"It is a very ancient and common doctrine—which I think true,—that the notion of adoration towards the image, so passes into its prototype and original, that both are included under the same veneration; so that not even in thought can the image be adored without the original, or be separated from it."‡ Dens also in his *Theology*, taking a middle course, not attributing positive *Latreia* to images *himself*, but representing the shades of opinion which might exist in the Church, says as follows:—he gives the words of Thomas Aquinas:—"Images may be worshipped with the same worship with which their prototypes are worshipped, but only with a relative or respective worship; whence the images of saints are worshipped with the respective worship of *Duleia*,

* Thom. Aquinas, *Summ. par. iii. quæst. xxv. art. iii.*

† *Instit. Moral. tom. i. lib. ix. c. vi.*

‡ *De Cultu Adorationis, libri tres; I. II. Disp. viii. c. iii. p.*

283. Cited by Mr. Palmer.

those of the blessed Virgin with the relative worship of Hyper-Duleia, those of Christ and God with the relative worship of Latreia." And then after some other observations he concludes:—"However it may be, let it be enough for us against the sectaries, that all Catholics [Roman] teach and prove that the images of the saints are to be venerated."

We need not go farther: a volume might be made of extracts from all sorts of writers, and from their authoritative catechisms, all bearing on the same point; more particularly from the Breviary and Missal—their authorized books of devotion. In the latter we continually find forms for consecrating and blessing crosses, in which the priest calls upon the people to adore the wood of the cross; and then both priest and people kneel down, take off their shoes, and kiss the cross and adore it. This is found in one of the Missals. Then in the Breviary for the 14th of September,—the festival of the Exaltation of the Cross,—you find this prayer, addressed personally to it, as though it were a living being. "O cross, more splendid than the stars, illustrious throughout the world, much beloved by men, more holy than all things, who alone wast worthy to bear the treasure of the world, bearing sweet wood, sweet nails, a sweet burden, *save this present multitude assembled this day in thy praise.*" But I forbear to say more. Only add to these quotations from

their councils, their authors, and their public formularies which I have now laid before you, the actual and daily *practices* of their Church, and the evidence will be complete. Only let those who have travelled in foreign countries testify as to what they have witnessed with their own eyes; the lighting of tapers before the images, the bowing down, the kissing, the dressing up of the images on particular days with ornamented clothes and jewels, the crowding round certain favourite images of tutelary saints, specially those who are supposed to have power over diseases either of man or cattle, and invoking them with continual prayer; and more particularly, let those who have seen such things, call to mind the chapel of the Virgin—at all times crowded,—her image set on high, and crowds of votaries around it, while at the same moment the altar of the high and living God is forsaken and bare. Only let these things be added, together with the fact, that they are never forbidden by the clergy, that they are not preached against, that no voice is ever raised against them, be they ever so degrading: nay, that the clergy themselves partake in many instances, of the very worst part of them. I say, once more, let all these *facts* be added to the public authoritative teaching which I have presented to you, and who can then have a doubt, but that in the Church of Rome, as a Church generally, the idolatrous use of

images, as it was at the Council of Trent, so to this day, is not only not forbidden, but taught, sanctioned, and approved?

And now, my brethren, there remains but one more duty for me in this lecture; and that is, to prove to you how highly sinful all these practices are, and how it was our bounden duty in this country to rid ourselves of them, and restore the Church to its former purity, even as by God's grace we did at the Reformation. And how are we to prove it? Just as in all other doctrines, by a reference to antiquity, that is, the writings of the fathers in the purer ages; and, above all, by reference to the Word of God. As to antiquity, when I was before describing the historical rise and progress of image-worship, it was asserted then that it was never heard of among Christians until the fourth century; and I there mentioned many historical facts, by which this was demonstrated. But now I shall confine myself to the testimony of *writers*,—to those who have, either in the course of controversy, or in the course of teaching, given testimony against this gross corruption. And first:

Irenæus (A. D. 180):

“ They have certain images, some painted, but some made of different materials, seeing that the form and figure of Christ as he was in the flesh, was made by Pilate. And these figures they crown, and set them forth together with the

statues of the philosophers.” All this he says in rebuke of the *heresy* of the Gnostics, against whom he is writing.*

Clemens Alexandrinus (A.D. 200):

“It is evidently forbidden us to exercise that deceitful art; for it is written, ‘Thou shalt not make any similitude.’”†

Tertullian (A.D. 200):

An image (ειδος) in Greek signifies a *form*, and an *idol* (ειδωλον) in Greek signifies a little form; therefore every form or little form (image or idol) must have the name of an IDOL. Therefore idolatry is a service to an idol” (the idol being defined to be *an image*).‡

Minutius Felix (A.D. 210):

“We neither worship crosses, nor wish for them. Ye who consecrate wooden gods, wooden crosses, as parts of your gods, perhaps may worship them.”§

Origen (A.D. 230):

“The Christians do not make or use images in religion; they are by God forbidden to do so.”||

Lactantius (A.D. 300):

“It is not to be doubted but that wherever there is an image, there is no religion.”¶

* Advers. Hæres. i. c. xxiv.

† Cohortat. ad Gentes, edit. Wirceb. i. p. 104.

‡ Tertull. de Idololatr. c. iii. iv. edit. Wirceb.

§ Octav. § xxix. edit. Wirceb. p. 590.

|| Contr. Cels. lib. vii. & viii. ¶ Lib. ii. de Origin. Error.

Ambrose (A.D. 380):

“The Church does not know anything of empty forms, and vain figures of images, It knows only the true substance of the Trinity.”*

St. Augustin (A.D. 400):

“Follow not the troops of the unskilful, who in true religion itself are superstitious, or given to lusts. I know that there are many worshippers of sepulchres and pictures. . . . How vain, how hurtful, how sacrilegious they are, I have purposed to show in another volume.”† And again: “Who worships or prays looking upon an image, and does not become so affected as to think he is heard by it, and to hope that what he longs for will be granted him by it: against this feeling, whereby human and carnal infirmity may easily be ensnared, the Scriptures of God utter things well known. Have these images mouths, and speak not; have they eyes, and see not; do we pray to them, in that through them we pray to God? Images are of more avail to bow down the unhappy mind, in that they have mouth, eyes, ears, nostrils, hands, and feet; than they have to correct it, in that they speak not, see not, hear not, smell not, touch not, walk not.”‡

All these are writers of the first four centuries. They bear evident witness to the truth of what has been said, that in the purer ages of Christianity image-worship was a thing unknown.

* *De Fugâ Sæcul.* tom. i. † *De Moribus Ecclesiæ*, lib. i.

‡ *Augustin.* in *Ps.* 113, *Serm.* ii. § v.

But if all else were put aside, if all arguments from reason, and all arguments from antiquity, were dropt and put aside as nothing, yet in God's word alone we should take our ground, as most confidently affirming that there is no sin so hateful to the nature of God,—no sin so frequently spoken of as utterly abominable in his sight,—no sin for which we see such continual punishments awarded by the special indignation of God,—as this sin of making, or setting up, or venerating images.

Now is it possible that Romanists should draw any arguments from Scripture *on their own side*? Yes, most strange to say; leaving out the whole spirit of the Bible, they fasten upon one or two solitary texts, and do attempt to defend their usages by the help of such texts. For instance, Bellarmine brings forward the passage of Scripture which describes the cherubims, in the twenty-fifth chapter of Exodus: “Two cherubims,” he says, “of beaten gold were directed to be placed at the two ends of the mercy-seat;—these cherubims being over the ark, they must have been adored by the people.” But to this the reply is immediate. The ark was placed in the holy of holies, into which none but the high-priest entered *once a year*. The *people* never beheld the cherubims, therefore the people never could have worshipped them. Again, Bellarmine brings forward the passage of Scripture which describes the setting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and says, that as God himself had directed the people

to look up to this serpent for the sake of their healing; and as it was expressly a type or form of Christ, therefore it follows that the setting up types or forms of Christ are allowed by God, and that it is lawful to look upon them with honour and veneration. His words are, "If Christ in the form of a serpent might be venerated, why not Christ in the form of a man?"* But surely this is a most unfortunate instance to bring forward. Would not any one who knew the Scriptures call to mind immediately what took place in the after history of this brazen serpent. There was no idolatry in the children of Israel looking up at the brazen serpent, and so receiving their cure by faith, for they did so in express obedience to God. It is not said, "Whosoever *prayed to*, or *adored*, or *fell down before* the brazen serpent," but simply, "Whosoever *beheld* it." It was a sign of the faith within, faith which had reference to the promise of God made by his servant Moses. But what became of this brazen serpent afterwards? It seems to have been treasured up by the Jewish people, as a relic or memento of the signal deliverance which God had vouchsafed to them; and though at first their respect to it was no idolatry, yet afterwards it came to pass that they did, just like the Romanists of whom we now are speaking, "*burn incense to it*." They did that to the brazen serpent which Romanists do to their images—either worshipped it directly or indirectly,

* Bellarmin. cap. xii. § i.

and signified their worship by burning incense. But what is said thereupon? Why—when Hezekiah the good king determined to purge the Jewish Church of her many corruptions, and more especially her idolatry, this very brazen serpent is one of the things mentioned which he destroyed; one of the things for doing which he received praise from God, as a destroyer of idols. “He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it *Nehushtan*,” which is translated in the margin of our Bibles, “*a piece of brass* ;”^{*} that is, it is no *God*,—it is no object of *worship*,—it is not fit for your prayers or your incense, or any religious veneration,—it is nothing but *Nehushtan*—“a piece of brass.”

But again, among other things, Bellarmin brings forward in excuse for his Church’s images the fact, that many times in Scripture “God is described as having human limbs. It is said that He stands, or sits, or walks. It is said that He has a throne, a seat, a foostool, and the like. Why, therefore,” he continues, “cannot that be exhibited in a picture, which is thus depicted in Scripture?” But surely every little child would know how to answer such a question as this. These descriptions are given of the Deity, from our imperfect language. God is a spirit; but God nevertheless

^{*} 2 Kings xviii. 4.

acts towards the children of men in certain ways adapted to our comprehension; and we speaking of Him in return, must speak of Him in terms adapted to our comprehension. This is unavoidable. But from this figurative manner of speech, describing hands, and eyes, and the like, to build a material or representative image of God, endued with such hands and eyes, is surely a conclusion utterly unworthy of any understanding beyond that of a child.* And yet it is on such reasoning as this that Bellarmine brings forward what he calls his Scripture proofs.

But let us turn now to those passages of Scripture which are on the other side. And what do we find there? Why, the whole Bible seems to rise up as one great mass of protestation against this gross perversion of the truth. Look at the history of that golden calf which the Israelites set up while Moses was in the mount. This golden calf was not an image of any false god, but it was merely an image to represent some source of protection, and keep God in their remembrance. It is very important to observe that the true God Jehovah was not forgotten in the construction of

* Thus they absolutely dare to make a representation of God the Father, and to catechise on it in the following words:

“How do you prove it lawful to paint God the Father like an old man, seeing He is a pure spirit, and hath no body?—Because He appeared to the prophet Daniel in the shape of an old man.” (*Dan.* vii.)—Abridgment, as above, p. 50.

the golden calf, for you will observe, while the calf was being set up, Aaron exhorted the people to bring their offerings; for to-morrow, he said, "is a feast unto the LORD." But yet, though the remembrance and the worship of the true God was retained, still, by the mere fact of making this image, God's wrath was kindled against them, and He said to Moses: "Thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have *corrupted themselves*. They have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it." Look also at the golden calves of Jeroboam, which he set up, the one at Dan, and the other at Bethel;—not that he forgot, or wished the people to forget, the true Jehovah,—but he added these calves as additional objects and stimulants to worship. But the Scripture says: "*This thing became a sin.*" Look also at the general language in which the idolatrous kings are spoken of, both of Israel and Judah, and the voices of the prophets sent specially to denounce God's anger,—the miseries, the woes, the national destruction that awaited them on all sides,—the final dispersion of one of their kingdoms, — the subjugation and captivity for seventy years of the other,—and, to take single passages, just let us fix upon the fourth chapter of Deuteronomy, where this specific warning is denounced,—a warning which refers, not to the idols of false gods,—not to the worshipping,—but even to the very MAKING of an image,—on the express

ground that God can have no similitude : “Ye came near and stood under the mountain, and the mountain burned with fire unto the midst of heaven, with darkness, clouds, and thick darkness. And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire. Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude ; only ye heard a voice. Take ye good heed, therefore, unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire, lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, *the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female.*” Or fix upon the second commandment,—that which was placed among the most solemn of God’s holy ordinances, and accompanied with all the terrible denunciations of His power and majesty,—that which was to form, even as our Lord Jesus Christ afterwards taught us, the code of moral law to all nations and for all times, never to perish. Observe the words,—how *comprehensive*,—how formed to exclude all extenuation or excuse, either in the thing or being represented, or in the motive for which it might be represented, or in the sort of service which might be done to it : “Thou shalt not make ANY *graven image*, or ANY *likeness* of ANY thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not *bow down thyself* to them, *nor serve them.*” And lastly—for we cannot go through all

the passages—take that place of the prophet Isaiah which has no equal for the beauty of its poetry, or for the strength of description by which he sets out in indignation the stupid folly of the maker of a graven image: “The carpenter stretcheth out his rule, he marketh it with a line, he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man, that it may remain in the house. He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak, which he strengtheneth for himself among the trees of the forest; he planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it. Then shall it be for a man to burn, for he will take thereof, and warm himself,—yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread,—yea, he maketh a God, and worshippeth it. *He maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto.* He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh. He roasteth roast, and is satisfied; yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire; and the residue thereof he maketh a God, even his graven image; he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my God. He feedeth on ashes. A deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand.”

SERMON XV.

REV. XIX. 10.

“ And I fell at his feet to worship him, and he said unto me, See thou do it not ; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus ; WORSHIP GOD.”

THE setting up of images and relics as objects of religious veneration, is so repugnant to our sense of reason, and if not actual idolatry, so manifestly approaches towards it, that we do not find the slightest symptom or semblance of it in our own Church, in any of her usages or formularies. There is no common ground even of the smallest compass, upon which the two Churches of Rome and England can, in this respect, confer together. But it is not so in that subject of which it will be my duty to speak as next in order, ANGELS and SAINTS. There is between us, on this subject, *to a certain extent*, some common ground upon which we can speak. Both in regard to those holy men the apostles and first martyrs of Christianity, and also those immortal beings who dwell in the presence of God, “ his ministering spirits,” our Church does hold a certain religious respect ; differing only

from the Church of Rome, when the Church of Rome leaves the Church Catholic, in making them objects of worship or mediators of prayer. To set this before you in its full extent and consequences, it will be my duty to explain in the first instance, the exact opinions which our Church holds on this head; and after that, to point out the unjustifiable additions and innovations of Rome.

The utmost height to which our Church carries her notion of the reverence which is due either to angels or saints, is that of holding them in memory. She thinks it right to *commemorate* them, she thinks it a right doctrine also to hold, that we join with them in a mystical communion and fellowship; they in heaven forming the invisible, and we on earth forming the visible Church of Christ: but anything beyond this she utterly abhors. Thus you will see, in regard to angels, a special day set apart by our Church for their commemoration. On the 29th of September,—the festival of St. Michael and all angels,—we address Almighty God in prayer, asking, that “as the holy angels always do Him service in heaven, so by His appointment they may succour and defend us on earth;” wherein you will perceive, that so far from our worshipping or doing them service, we look upon them as joined with us in doing God service *themselves*. And though we recognize them according to the Scripture, as

“ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation,” and so pray for their succour; yet it is not to *them* that we pray, but to God. We pray not that they will directly and of themselves come to us, and be our guardians; but we pray to God to send them to us; though recognizing in them an elevated scale of existence, yet not so elevated but that they are with us *fellow-servants*. Thus particularly in the hymn “Te Deum laudamus” we join them with ourselves in our praise of God: “To Thee all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein; to Thee Cherubim and Seraphim continually do cry.” And in the hymn “Benedicite:” “O ye angels of the Lord, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever.” And in a similar manner in the holy Communion, we do not praise or worship *them*; quite the contrary: we join ourselves to them in their own angelic hymn to God:—“Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name.”

Secondly, in regard to the saints: Our Church holds a very decided opinion as to the duty and the usefulness of commemorating the saints; she sets apart special holidays for their memory, as you will see in our Calendar and Book of Common Prayer. On those days she appoints specific services, collects, gospels, and epistles, and sometimes

lessons, suitable to the saint who is commemorated. And particularly on All Saints' Day, she sums up all the faithful departed, either known or unknown, as objects of praise and thankfulness in the sight of God, speaking of them "as knit together in one communion and fellowship, in the mystical body of His Son Christ our Lord; and beseeching God to "grant us grace so to follow His blessed saints in all virtuous and godly living, that we may come to those unspeakable joys which He has prepared for them that unfeignedly love Him; through Jesus Christ our Lord." Again she firmly and decidedly holds, that the saints do keep with us and we with them, a perpetual communion; and so we express our belief in one of the Articles of the Creed—"The Communion of Saints."—And in the prayer for the Church Militant, we "bless God's holy Name for all His servants departed this life in His faith and fear." And in the Burial of the Dead, we give God hearty thanks, and ask of Him, that "we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of His holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory." All these passages in our Ritual and Church Services, sufficiently explain the degree of veneration with which we would contemplate those spiritual beings who exist in another world; either holy men gone before us, or angelic beings ministering around

God's throne. Let me repeat it once more for fear of misunderstanding. It is simply that of *Commemoration* and *Communion*.

But what do we find in the Church of Rome? This feeling of simple commemoration is quickly carried forward into the adoration and worship due to the Divine Being himself. Whether it be *Duleia*, the lower sort of worship, or *Latreia*, the higher, we will not dispute; at any rate, it is some sort of worship which allows them no longer to be considered as fellow-servants with ourselves, which attributes to them powers and authority as of God, which asks of them for grace, help, strength, preservation, and all those blessings and benefits, which can alone depend upon God himself. There are four different stages or degrees, in which these prayers are offered; and these degrees differ very much as to their idolatrous tendency. 1. The lowest or most excusable degree of saint or angel-worship, is that wherein the prayer is indeed offered *directly* to God, but in this shape; that He would graciously hear the prayers of His saints, which they offer on our behalf. Now we might be willing to allow that the saints do offer prayers in behalf of human beings still remaining on earth,—we might be willing to allow that there is a knowledge with them, of the things going on in this world below, and that consequently they have an interest in those whom they have formerly loved on earth.

We might be willing to allow this as possible ; I see no harm in doing so.* But what need is

* Unless we allow the doctrine that it is possible the prayers of the saints may be offered in our behalf, we do not quite fulfil the entire meaning of a "*communion*." Heylin says ; " To think that any of the saints in the state of bliss were unmindful of such friends as they leave behind, were to deprive them of a quality inseparable from the soul,—the *memory* ; and to suppose them negligent of such pious duties as the commending of a sinner to the throne of grace, were to deprive them of a virtue inseparable from the saints,—their *charity*.....Origen, for his part, was of this opinion, that the saints helped us by their prayers. So was St. Cyprian : ' The saints,' says he, ' though sure of their own salvation, are yet solicitous for ours.' And so far we are right enough, in my poor opinion ; and if our adversaries of the Church of Rome would proceed no farther, the difference between us would be soon made up. The error is not in the doctrine, but in the application. For as it happeneth many times that an ill use may be made of a very good doctrine, so in the darker and declining times of the Church of Christ, it was conceived to be a solecism in the way of piety not to *commend our prayers and desires to them*, who had so carefully *commended our prayers to God*. And so at last, as there is seldom any ' *medium inter summa et præcipitia*,' in the words of Tacitus,—no stop in tumbling down a hill till we come to the bottom,—the saints in heaven, against their will, and besides their knowledge, became the ordinary mediators between God and man.....And here we have the point at issue. We grant indeed, because we must, unless we absolutely mean to renounce our creed, that the saints pray for us in the general, as being some part of that communion which belongs to them, as fellow-members with us of that mystical body of which Christ is the head. But yet do we not think it lawful to *pray to them*, but to *praise God for them*, which is that part of the communion which belongs to us."—*Heylin on the Creed*, folio, p. 418.

there to resort, in this circuitous way, to the Divine Being, and ask of Him to hear their prayers, when He has expressly told us that He is willing to hear us himself. His ears are ever open to the prayers of the faithful ; He invites us, He teaches us, He bids us ever come “ boldly to the throne of grace.” Why then resort to Him in an indirect manner, and ask of Him merely to hear the prayers of saints or angels, when he has promised to hear ourselves ? To say nothing more, it betrays a great distrust of the goodness, and the mercy, and the truth of God. 2. The next degree is that wherein is introduced into the prayer, a petition for the protection or patronage of the saints, and mention is made of their merits ; a request is made to God to hear them by reason of the good works, the faith, the courage, or the martyrdom of that saint, whose name they record. This is obviously in contradiction of the great scriptural feature of the Christian religion, that there is one only person in whose merits we have any confidence in trusting ; but nevertheless, bad as it is, it is not direct idolatry ; for the prayer, as in the former case, is directed to God. 3. In the next degree an advance is made rapidly into positive idolatry ; for leaving God as the person to whom the prayer is said, they invoke the very names or persons of the saint or angel whose help they require. Still however, it is only by means of their intercession. They do not in this stage

infer, that the saint or angel has direct power to grant the request; it is only intercessional power. They trust that by the intercession or advocacy which the saint or angel has a right to make with God, that He (God) may be induced to use that power in their behalf. 4. The last stage, is that wherein we come to the climax of an idolatrous devotion. By idolatrous, I mean, the setting up some other thing or person as the direct object of prayer, in the place of God. And this is certainly done, when human beings, no longer regarding those grounds which I have just mentioned, of intercession with God, or employing their merits to ask a thing of God through mediation, but putting God entirely aside, ask directly and personally of a saint or angel, either for temporal or spiritual blessings.

Now all these stages of invocation, we are prepared to show, exist in the Church of Rome,—authorized by her teaching, and confirmed by her practice. We have very little trouble to find them, for they exist in her breviary and missal, and are in constant use to this day. In the breviary for the 20th of July, we find the following: “We beseech thee, O Lord, suffer the blessed Margaret, virgin and martyr, to ask forgiveness for us.”* And again, on the 28th of July: “O Lord, let the blessed confession of thy saints Nazarius, Celsus, Victor, and Innocent, strengthen

* Breviary, in die xx. Julii.

us, and worthily obtain help for our weakness.”* These are instances of the *first* stage of saint-worship above described. But again, we find the following in the missal: “By the prayers of the apostle Paul, O Lord, we beseech thee sanctify the gifts of thy people, that those things which are grateful by thine own institution, may be more grateful by the *intercession* of him who supplicates in our behalf.”† Or take another from the breviary. On the 13th day of July, the feast of Anacletus, pope and martyr: “O God, who dost rejoice us by the annual solemnity of thy blessed martyr and pope Anacletus, mercifully grant that as we honour his festival, so we may rejoice in his *protection*.”‡ Or still farther, where the express word *merits* is mentioned: “O God, who didst adorn the blessed pope Nicholas with many miracles, grant, we beseech thee, that by his merits we may be set free from the fires of hell.”§ These are instances of the second stage of saint-worship. Again, in the feast of St. Bonaventura, we find the following antiphon: “O blessed Bonaventura, light of the holy Church, lover of divine law, deprecate for us the Son of God.”|| Or again, December the 7th, in the same words: “O blessed Ambrose, deprecate for us the Son of God.” Or continually in the litany of the saints: “O Ra-

* Idem in die xxviii. Julii.

† Missal. Festa Junii, in Comm. S. Pauli Apostoli.

‡ Breviary, die xiii. Julii. § Id. in die vi. Decembr.

|| Breviary, in xiv. Julii.

phael, pray for us ; O Mary Magdalene, pray for us ; O Abel, pray for us ; O Abraham, pray for us,"—and the like. These are instances of the third sort of saint-worship. But now we come to the last,—that which absolutely asks blessings of creatures, and altogether sets aside God. As for instance : Pope Pius VII, in his decree of the 28th of April 1807, specifies the following invocations, and grants three hundred days' indulgence to those that should use them : " Jesus, Joseph and Mary, I offer to you my heart and soul ; Jesus, Joseph and Mary, assist me in my last agony ; Jesus, Joseph and Mary, may my soul expire in peace with you,"—where you observe that the saints Joseph and Mary are placed upon a parallel, as objects of prayer, with the Son of God himself. Again, Cardinal Bona directs the following : " Holy angels, seals of the divine likeness, full of wisdom, perfect in beauty, be present with me, and defend me from the assaults of evil spirits, from the frauds and snares of the enemy," &c. &c.* And once more, on the 18th of January, the following hymn is directed to be offered up to St. Peter : " O Peter, blessed shepherd, of thy mercy receive our prayers, and loose by thy word the chains of our sins,—thou to whom power is given to open heaven to the earth, and to shut it when opened."†

These instances will be sufficient to prove our

* Bona, Oper. Spirit. tom. i. p. 13.

† In die xviii. Jan. Anniversary of the Chair of St. Peter.

point, and to demonstrate to you the various shades of violation of God's word, which the prayers of the Church of Rome have introduced. And they are not only found, as I have shown, in her public and recognized formularies,—they have not crept into the Church by accident, as used in one country, and not another,—but they are all openly maintained and commanded. Their propriety is canvassed, argued, and defended, both by her principal divines and by her public councils. The Council of Trent thus decrees : “ The Holy Synod commands the bishops and others who have the office and care of instruction, that according to the custom of the Catholic [Roman] and Apostolic Church they make it a chief point diligently to instruct the faithful concerning the *intercession and invocation of Saints*, the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images ;—teaching them that the saints reigning together with Christ offer to God their prayers for men,—that it is good and useful to *invoke them with supplication*,—and, on account of the benefits obtained from God through his Son Jesus Christ, to have recourse *to their prayers, aid, and assistance*.”* The Creed of Pope Pius IV asserts the same : “ I constantly hold that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and *invoked*, and that they offer prayers to God for us.” All which is abundantly confirmed by their private writers,

* Concil. Trident. Sess. xxv.

—Bellarmin, Bona, Bonaventura, Salmeron, and others; but more particularly sealed and made authoritative in the Church up to the present day, by the following encyclical letter of Pope Gregory XVI: “We will also earnestly beseech with humble prayers from the prince of the apostles, Peter, and from his co-apostle Paul, that you may stand as a wall,—that no other foundation be laid but that which has been laid. Relying on this delightful hope, we trust that the author and finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ, will at length console us in all our tribulations.”—Where you cannot but observe that there is mention made of Jesus Christ as *consoling* them, and as being the author and finisher of their faith;—but yet the prayer is directed to the apostles Peter and Paul.

Thus much then for the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome in the worship of saints and angels. But have they no defence? Do they merely assert these things without any attempt at argument to prove themselves right? No; they have various grounds of defence. At one time they will appeal to Scripture,—at another time they will conceal the worst features of their case, drop the words *worship* and *prayer*, and substitute the word *honour* or *veneration*,—speaking as though they did no more than venerate saints and angels as they would human beings of great eminence on earth, and as though they did not ask their prayers and intercession any farther than

they might ask them of good and pious men still alive. Thus Gother would say: "The Papist truly represented believes that there is only one God, and that it is most damnable idolatry to make Gods of men, either living or dead. He confesses that we are all redeemed by the blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only mediator of redemption; but as to mediators of intercession—that is, such as we may lawfully desire to pray to—he does not doubt but that it is acceptable to God we should have many. Moses was such a mediator for the Israelites,—Job for his three friends,—Stephen for his persecutors. So also every sick man desires the congregation to be his mediators, by remembering him in their prayers."* In this you observe a distinction made between "mediation of *redemption*" and "mediation of *intercession*." There is truth in the observations, as far as they go. We are intercessors for one another here upon earth. We do, and ought, to pray for one another here upon earth; and, as I said before, I do not see that there is anything anti-scriptural to imagine that the saints may carry on, in their present abode, the same prayers that they commenced on earth;—but all this is beside the question; it does not come up to the point of making those saints actual objects of prayer,—of asking them for protection and health, and succour in the hour of death,—of presuming

* Gother, extract by Challoner, *Edinburgh*, 1836.

on their merits, and thereby substituting them for Christ. Thus again you find in the catechism of the Council of Trent a similar attempt to avoid the question. It is there said : “ Kings are to be honoured as those by whose agency God governs the world ; much more, therefore, are the angels to be honoured, inasmuch as they are more excellent than kings.”* Who could ever gainsay so evident a truth? It is just precisely on this ground that we *do* give honour to angels, and hold them in holy memory, as I have shown you that our Church does. But the question is not about holding them in *honour*, but praying to them, and adoring them. In the same way, Bossuet says : “ We entreat the Almighty either to confer upon us some blessing, or to deliver us from some misfortune ; but since the saints are more pleasing to him than we are, we hence entreat them to lend us their assistance, and to obtain for us the grant of our requests. For this reason the forms of our petitions are extremely different. Addressing ourselves to God, we say to Him : ‘ Have mercy on us,’ ‘ Hear us ;’ whereas, speaking to the saints, we say merely, ‘ Pray for us.’”† Now even if this were true, we should still have much to say ; but we have shown by instances above given that it is not true ;—that, in fact, many prayers and expressions of trust and faith are made

* Catechism, Conc. Trident. p. 354.

† Bossuet, cited by Gother as above.

to the saints in precisely the same words as those made to God ;—as in that prayer to St. Peter : “ O Peter, blessed shepherd, of thy mercy receive the prayers of us who supplicate.” Where is the difference between that and “ O God, blessed Creator, of thy mercy receive the prayers of us who supplicate” ? So that all this is worth nothing ;—it is a mere subterfuge. I have shown that there are four different degrees of adoring the saints. The defence of making them mere *intercessors* for prayer might avail for the three first sorts, but it can be of no avail whatever for the fourth, in which, passing by the Almighty altogether, the invocation is made to the angel or the saint in a direct and personal application.

But they also appeal to *Scripture* in their defence—at least, some of them do. The Council of Trent is itself silent on the point of Scripture, as though it feared to moot it ; but not so the catechism of the Council, nor the Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament, nor those smaller catechisms which are set forth at this day as the authorized books of instruction of the Romish people. These are by no means silent ; therefore, let us now hear what they have to say. In the first place, the Trent catechism says : “ The Scriptures inform us that the love which the angels bear to us prompts them to pour out their prayers for those countries over which they are placed by Providence, and for us whose guardians they are, and

whose prayers and tears are present before the throne of God ;” and then afterwards the catechism refers to the tenth chapter of Daniel (*v.* 13), where Michael the archangel is described as helping Daniel. But any one with the very slightest observation will perceive that the fact of Michael the archangel *helping* Daniel, does not infer that Daniel had been previously offering prayers to him. He helped Daniel as the ministering spirit sent from God ; but the point at issue is some prayer offered by Daniel to Michael. But of this we hear not a syllable. Again, allusion is made to the case of Jacob wrestling with an angel, where he would not let the angel go until he had blessed him. This indeed in a figure may represent men wrestling with God in prayer, and prevailing ; but as to the fact of prayer directly offered to that angel, we do not find anything said. And if anything were said, still, what would it amount to ? Let us look to the thirtieth verse, and there we find that the angel was God. “ And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.” So that nothing can be made out of these two passages.

In the same style of subterfuge, endeavouring to escape from the real point at issue, we find a modern catechism, called the “ *Abridgment of Christian Doctrine*,” to which I have had frequent occasion to refer. A question is put thus : “ *Q.* Is it lawful

* Catechism, Conc. Trident. p. 355.

to honour the angels and saints?—*A.* It is with Duleia, an inferior honour, proportioned to their excellency, which they have from God. It is God we honour in them.—*Q.* How prove you that?—*A.* First out of Joshua (v. 14), where Joshua did it: ‘Joshua fell flat on the ground; and adoring, said, What saith our Lord to his servant?’” Now, if we examine this passage a little closely, we shall be obliged to confess that an angel—called in the sacred text *a man*—did appear to Joshua, and called himself the captain of the Lord’s host, and that Joshua did unrebuked fall down and worship him. Of that there can be no doubt; but the value of that place turns upon the question, who was that angel or man? Just precisely as before in the case of the wrestling of Jacob, the angel with whom he wrestled was God, so here also it was God. We prove it most satisfactorily; for you will observe the words which the angel says: “Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy.” These were the very words which the Lord had used before, when he appeared in a similar way to Moses; and you may observe also in the next chapter, which is a continuation of the same history, that in the second verse it is said: “And the *Lord* said unto Joshua,” which directly shows that he who was before spoken of as an angel, or captain of the Lord’s host, was in reality the Lord himself. So that the worship paid and accepted—nay, commanded—in

this history, was on the part of the living God, and not on the part of any created angel. But to continue with the catechism of which we are speaking: “*Q.* How prove you that?—*A.* Secondly, Apocal. xxii. 8, where St. John did it, though the angel had once before willed him not to do it, in regard of his apostolical dignity: ‘And I fell down,’ saith he, ‘to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things.’” But surely there never could be a more unfair quotation of Scripture than this,—I may almost say, a more gross withholding of the truth. The text is given as though it stopped at the assertion of the fact of St. John’s worshipping the angel;—whereas, if we look on only to the next sentence, we shall find that St. John was a second time rebuked for desiring so to do,—rebuked in the very same words as before. Compare both passages (*Rev.* xix. 10, and *Rev.* xxii. 9.) You will find them as nearly as possible the same; and so far is it from the truth, according to the words of the Romish catechism, “*that St. John did it,*” that we find that *he did it not*. Being desirous of doing it, he was rebuked: “Then saith the angel unto me, See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book. **WORSHIP GOD.**”

These references will give you an insight into the manner of the Romish defence from Scripture.

It is evident that they can only rely upon the ignorance of their people. They can only trust that those to whom they speak, have no Scriptures to examine for themselves (which generally is the case). Only let the Romanist search for himself, and examine God's holy word with a fair and impartial mind, and he will directly find, as in the present instance, how signally it makes against him. Being misquoted, mutilated, or abridged, it will recoil against himself when once explained, with tenfold force.

And this is not all that Scripture says. To explain the misquotations of the Romanists, is but a small evidence. Let us take the Old Testament,—let us take the New Testament,—from the first page to the last,—from Genesis to Revelations ; if any one observable thing can be pointed out conspicuous, as the feature of God's revelation, it is this. That *God* is the only object of worship, and that *Jesus* is the only Mediator. How often, and with what terrible signs of power and glory, was this precept made known, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.” “I am the Lord and there is none else : there is no God beside Me.” How many prayers there are, and intercessions of holy men in Scripture—of Abraham for Sodom, of Isaac for his son Jacob, of Jacob for Ephraim and Manasseh, of Samuel, of Daniel, of David in the Psalms, of all the prophets,—how many invocations we continually find, and yet not one addressed to any being save

God alone. Angels are described, particularly in the Psalms, and saints are held forth as objects of admiration and love, but always called upon to join with David in worshipping God, never made either objects of prayer, or in any way mediators for prayer.

And if we go to the New Testament, we shall find the same truth just as conspicuous. The office of angels is continually introduced. Peter was delivered from prison by an angel, yet we do not find that Peter addressed any prayer to that angel, either of intercession or of thanksgiving. The angels ministered unto Christ in his human nature on several occasions, yet is there no word spoken to them in request of help ; but his prayer was alone to God. Our Saviour gives us many directions to prayer, but He always says, " My Father," or " Our Father." " When thou prayest, pray to thy Father which is in secret." And in one remarkable text, he places the angels and the Father in juxta-position, and while he speaks of the former as ministers of help, he mentions the latter as alone the object of prayer, from whom to gain those ministers of help. " Thinkest thou that I cannot now *pray to my Father*, and *He shall presently give me* more than twelve legions of angels." Again, all through Scripture we have many relations of escape from danger, of bitter persecutions, of violent deaths, yet in no single case is there any cry lifted up but unto God. As in St. Stephen : They stoned Ste-

phen, calling upon—not any angel or saint, but—“God, and saying,” not O Michael, save me! or O angels of God, deliver me! O holy prophets and martyrs, receive my soul! but “*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*” We have many instances of astonishment wrought in the hearts of heathens, at the sight of miracles performed by the apostles, and they looking to fall down and worship them, after the manner of heathenism; but this invariably rejected with horror and alarm, on the ground of God only to be worshipped. As Barnabas and Paul.—“Sirs, Why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that you should turn from these vanities unto *the living God*, which made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things therein.” And Cornelius, who fell down at Peter’s feet “and worshipped him, but Peter took him up, saying: stand up, I myself also am a man.” And the case of St. John, to which allusion has been made in so unaccountable a manner; to whom the angel said, “See thou do it not. I am thy fellow-servant, *worship God.*” And finally, we have this emphatic direction of St. Paul, as if foreseeing the great apostacy from the faith which one day should prevail. “Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and *worshipping of angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind.”

But now we turn from Scripture to antiquity. How was it in the early Churches? In the times of persecution, when so many brave and patient Christians suffered martyrdom, and sealed their faith by their blood,—when so many righteous men passed lives of continual holiness, and piety, and self-denial, far beyond what we in these present days have any conception of,—how was it with them? do we find either that they, during their lives, invoked the aid of other saints who had gone before them, or that they themselves were invoked by others after death, or that angels formed a component part, either of their public or private devotions, as able to do for them anything by way of help or protection in the place of the Almighty, or of merits in the place of Christ? Do we find anything of this sort? Far from it. It was a practice indeed to assemble around the tombs of martyrs, and to worship there as places sanctified by the remains of the holy men. Of this I have spoken before, when explaining the origin of the worship of relics. (See p. 374.) It was their opinion, that the spirits of the martyrs and saints might be present with them in their worship, and Scripture itself had told them that the angels were present in their assemblies and watched over them;* but all this went no farther

* 1 Cor. xi. 10: "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, *because of the angels.*" This is generally considered by the commentators to refer to the presence of the

than the *communion* of which I before spoke, and the ministration of angels, as guarding and blessing men, under their office of "ministering spirits." But as to the *worship* of such holy beings, all antiquity speaks with one voice against it.

In the first place, the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 367), in so many words forbids it: "It does not behove Christians to leave the Church of God, and go and invoke angels, which things are forbidden; if therefore any one be detected idling in their secret *idolatry*, let him be accursed, because he has forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and gone to idolatry."* Agreeing with this, we have the writings of the fathers, furnishing us with abundant testimony. They may be ranged in two classes: First, those who speak negatively against it, when they insist on the worship of God only; and secondly, those who directly condemn it as an idolatrous custom.

Let us commence with *Ignatius* (A. D. 100). He is speaking of the necessity of unity in prayer,

holy angels in divine worship;—the reason of the woman "*having power on her head*," that is, a *covering*, or sign of subjection, is this,—that she worships in the presence of the holy angels, who would be displeased to behold any attempt to remove from herself that state of subjection to the man imposed upon her at the fall. In our own service, we recognize the worship of the angels as joined with our own: "*Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name.*"

* Concil. Laod. Canon xxxv.

inasmuch as there is *unity* in the person to whom prayer is to be made.

“ Let there be at one place, one prayer and one supplication, one mind and one hope in love. . . . All then throng as to one temple, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded from one Father, and is in one, and returned to one.”*

Again, *Clement of Alexandria* (A.D. 190) :

“ It is extreme ignorance to ask of those who are not Gods, as though they were Gods. Since there is only one good God, both we ourselves and the angels supplicate from Him alone, that some good things might be given to us, and others remain with us. In this way the Christian is always in a state of purity, fit for prayer. He prays *with angels* as being himself *equal with angels*, and as one who is never beyond the holy protecting guard ; and if he pray alone he has the whole choir of angels with him.”†

In the same way *Tertullian* (A.D. 200) :

“ We invoke the eternal God, the true God, the living God, for the safety of the emperor..... We Christians pray for all rulers a long life, a secure government, a safe home, a faithful people, a quiet world ; but for these things I cannot pray, except of Him from whom I know that I shall obtain. Because He is the one who alone grants.”‡

* Epist. ad Magnes.

* Stromata, lib. vii. § vii.

† Tertullian, Apology, § xxx.

And again, *Origen* (A.D. 230):

“We must pray to God alone, who is over all things, and we must pray also to the only-begotten and first-born of every creature,—the word of God; and we must implore him as our High Priest to carry our prayer, which first comes to Him; to his God, and our God, to his Father, and the Father of those who live agreeably to the word of God.”* And in another place;—“Every request and prayer, intercession, and giving of thanks must be sent up to Him who is God over all, through the High Priest, who is above all angels, even the living word of God,—for it is not reasonable to call upon angels without receiving a knowledge concerning them which is above man. But supposing the knowledge concerning them had been received, that knowledge describing their nature, and those to whom they are respectively assigned, would not give confidence in praying to any other than to Him who is sufficient for every thing,—God who is above all, through Our Saviour, the Son of God, who is the Word, and wisdom, and the truth. But for the angels of God to be favourable to us, and to do all things for us, our disposition towards God is sufficient; we imitate them to the utmost of human power, as they imitate God.”†

So likewise *Ambrose* (A.D. 370):

“Men are wont, when they are ashamed of

* *Origen. contr. Celsum, lib. viii. p. 786, § lx.*

† *Origen. contr. Celsum, lib. v. p. 579, § iv.*

neglecting God, to use this miserable excuse, that by these (saints or angels) they might go to God, as by officers we go to the king. But is any man so mad, so unmindful of his salvation, as to give the king's honour to an officer, when if any shall be found but to treat of such a matter, they will be justly condemned as guilty of high treason; and yet these men think themselves not guilty, who give the honour of God's name to a creature, and, forsaking the Lord, adore their fellow servants."*

Again *Lactantius* (A.D. 300) :

"The angels, although they are immortal, will not suffer themselves to be called gods, whose only office it is to be at God's command, and to do nothing at all but what He ordains. Therefore they will have no honour given unto themselves whose honour is in God."†

Next let us take *Athanasius* (A.D. 320) :

"Peter the Apostle, when Cornelius wished to worship him, hindered him, saying, 'I also am a man.' The angel in the Apocalypse, when St. John desired to worship him, hindered him, saying, 'See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant.' . . . Therefore to be worshipped is the part of God alone, and this the angels themselves know; and though they excel one another in glory, yet, they are all creatures, not in the number of those who are to be

* Ambrose in Rom. i.

† Lactantius, lib. ii. c. xvii.

worshipped, but in the number of those who worship the Lord.”*

So likewise *Gregory of Nyssa* (A.D. 370):

“The Divine Word has laid it down as a law, that of those things or persons which have arisen by creation, none should be worshipped among men.”†

And lastly, *St. Augustin* (A.D. 390):

“Whom could I find to reconcile me unto Thee? Should I have gone to the angels? With what sacraments? With what prayer? Many endeavouring to return unto Thee, and not being able to do it of themselves, have tried these things, and have fallen into the desire of curious visions.”‡

And here let us stop. In this, we should think, is abundant testimony, if any one would read aright, to convince and to convert from any pretence either of angel or of saint-worship. Consider it all together; we have our own intuitive reason, and sense of right and wrong,—our own natural idea of the greatness and the majesty of God,—which could not allow any associate in his divine honours. Besides this, we have the unanimous voice of all antiquity; and besides this, and above all, we have the very word of God, cautioning, warning, and instructing his creatures at all

* Orat. cont. Arian. iii. *Paris*, 1627, i. p. 394.

† Contr. Eunomian. Orat. iv. vol. ii. p. 144.

‡ Augustin. Confess. lib. x. cap. xlii.

times, as being "a jealous God," jealous of any withdrawal of that affection, that tribute, that entire subjugation of the heart and soul, either in adoring, or praising, or praying, which is His due, and His alone. And how after all this the Romanist can make blind his eyes, and gross his heart, and presume to fly in the teeth of the divine law, and out of a mock humility seek other means of help, and other sources of strength, and set up other objects of prayer besides the one living and true God, does indeed surpass our comprehension. The blindness and perverseness of man is in many cases a wonder past finding out.

There are two observations bearing on this subject which I should desire to set before you, by way of conclusion. They may suggest thoughts and matter for reflection for those who would meditate farther on these things. The first regards the worship of saints. I would ask the Romanist, Is it not his doctrine that all men, as a general rule, have to pass through purgatory? The saints and martyrs, however, whom they would invoke, are of course an exception. They are not supposed to be in purgatory, but in heaven. They are exempt from purgatory;—they have earned their direct and immediate presence with God. On this ground alone it is that prayer can be offered to them. But who is it that pronounces of a man, when dead, whether he be in purgatory or in heaven?—that is, whether he be a saint or

not?—whether he be a saint sufficient to receive prayers or not? Why, there is a process called canonization;—a certain bishop, or martyr, or confessor, or virgin, is *canonized*,—that is, pronounced to be a saint by the Roman pontiff. Thus you find in the Roman breviary, Leo, Bonaventura, Symphorosa, Margaret, Laurentius, and a thousand others, mixed up in the calendar with the holy apostles Paul and Peter, John and James, and the rest. Now the only ground upon which those persons could have been placed in the calendar as objects of prayer, is their canonization by the Pope. Is it not a subject then worthy of reflection, how it comes to pass that a *human being* can have the power of anticipating the judgment of God, as to the entrance of a soul into heaven? It surely is an anomaly that a sinner still on earth, still liable to temptation, still struggling against the evil one,—that a sinner such as this (for such an one even the Pope must be) should have the power of anticipating God's holy trial of the righteous and the wicked at the day of judgment; and at once, without regard to anything save his own discretionary power, lift up the soul of his brother into such an elevation in the presence of God, as to make him to the world a mediator worthy of the prayers of Christians.

The second reflection which I would hold out to you, would be this—(it would apply either to the angels or to the saints whose names might be

invoked) ;—if prayers are addressed to them,—as, for instance, “O Michael, pray for us,” “O Joseph, pray for us,” and the like,—it is possible that this very same prayer may be made by different persons, in different regions of the world, at the same moment of time. But the fact of praying on our part, presupposes the power of hearing on their part. The saint or angel, therefore, who is made into the object of prayer, must have the power of *ubiquity*,—that is, he must be everywhere, so as to be able to hear all the prayers that may be addressed to him from every possible region of the world ; and he must also have the power of *omniscience*,—that is, he must know all the circumstances, reasons, accidents, thoughts and motives, of the person praying,—otherwise he could not tell whether it would be right to grant the prayer, or no. If so,—ALL the angels, and ALL the saints (for they all are liable to be prayed to), must have the power of *ubiquity* and *omniscience*. But are not these powers—ubiquity and omniscience—attributes solely of the Godhead ? Where then would be the difference between the saint, the angel, and Almighty God himself ?*

* Thus speaks our homily on prayer :

“ There are certain conditions most requisite to be found in every such an one that must be called upon, which, if they be not found in Him unto whom we pray, then doth our prayer avail us nothing, but is altogether vain.

“ The first is, that He to whom we make our prayer be able

My brethren, these are two points quite perilous to think upon. Surely the Romanist would not *mean* these things; nay, if you pressed the matter home upon him in quiet reasoning, he would equally with ourselves hold up his hands in astonishment against it. Yet I do not see how it is possible, if he sets out with his premises of saint and angel-worship, to avoid these conclusions. Oh that he would see these things as right

to help us; the second is, that He will help us; the third is, that He be such an one as may hear our prayers; the fourth is, that He understand better than ourselves what we lack, and how far we have need of help. If these things be to be found in any other saving only God, then may we lawfully call upon some other besides God. But what man is so gross but he will understand that these things are proper only to Him who is omnipotent, and knoweth all things, even the very secrets of the heart,—that is to say, to God alone? Wherefore it followeth that we must call neither upon angel, nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon God, as St. Paul doth write: ‘How shall men call upon Him in whom they have not believed?’ So that invocation or prayer may not be made without faith in Him on whom they call, but that we must first believe in Him before we can make our prayer to Him; whereupon, we must only and solely pray unto God. For to say that we should either *believe* in angel or saint, or in any other living creature, were most horrible blasphemy against God and His holy word; neither ought this fancy to enter into the heart of any Christian man, because we are expressly taught in the word of the Lord to repose our faith in the blessed Trinity, in whose only name we are baptized, according to the express commandment of our Saviour Jesus Christ, in the last chapter of St. Matthew.”—*Book of Homilies*. Of Prayer, Second Part, folio, p. 204.

reason, and God's word, and the Church of Christ, would have him ;—that he would turn from the blindness of his path, and, as the holy angel bids him in the text, "*worship God.*" Let him in the name of truth cast aside his "voluntary humilities," and "come boldly to the throne of grace," to adore the name of God alone, who ruleth on high. Let him cast aside all his theoretical distinctions of degrees in religious worship,—his *Latreia* and *Duleia*,—his worshipping God through the *medium* of a saint, or through the *medium* of an image ;— they are scholastic subtleties and puerile distinctions, unworthy a faithful Christian, dangerous to his soul, and dishonouring his God. Let him come with us, and say with us in our eucharistic hymn : "Thou *only* art holy, thou *only* art the Lord, thou *only*, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father."

SERMON XVI.

ST. LUKE I. 48.

“He hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden : for behold, from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed.”

It has been before observed that the Church of Rome has devised three different sorts of religious worship. The highest sort, called *Latreia*, she reserves for God alone; and the lowest sort, *Duleia*, she appropriates to the saints, angels, images, and relics. But the VIRGIN MARY does not come under the same class of worship as either of the foregoing. Though inferior to the Deity, and so not meriting the highest sort of adoration, yet she is on all hands allowed to be superior to the other saints; and so she merits, in their theology, something peculiar to herself. They invent, therefore, a sort of worship especially in her behalf—below that of God, and above that of saints and angels; and this they call *HYPER-DULEIA*.* Of this peculiarity of worship, the

* See the explanation of these words at Sermon XIV. p. 371.

extent and practice of it in the Church of Rome, as making one of their errors distinguishing them from the Church Catholic, it will be my duty to speak in the present lecture; and while I do so, pointing out to you the very gross corruptions of this idolatry, you will, my brethren, I feel sure, rejoice with me in the acknowledgment of those blessings which Almighty God has preserved for this country and people; banishing from among them that which once so miserably darkened our whole tone of religious feeling, and restoring to them that light by which we now see and worship GOD ALONE in spirit and in truth.

I shall pursue the same plan as before,—first showing you the extent of the religious respect which we in the Church of England delight to pay to the Blessed Virgin, and then pointing out the corrupt additions of Rome, illustrating those additions by references to their authorized public books of devotion, and also to their recognized divines. Such a mass of corruption, and fearful falling away from God, will surpass, I venture to say, the very utmost notions you have ever formed of this very peculiar and distressing subject.

In our own Church we certainly do desire, and rightly desire, to pay respect and honour to the holy Mother of our Lord; I may say, that we do so beyond the other saints, from the fact of two holy days being set apart for the observance of events in connexion with her memory, whereas

only one day is made holy for others. These two days are thus described in our Prayer-book : the first is called "The Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin," and the second, "The Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary : " but if you observe the collects, gospels, and epistles, for those days, appointed in our Prayer-books, you will see how careful we are, that, while we give honour, we give no worship ; we seem, as it were, carefully to shun even the mention of the Virgin's name in those collects ;—to turn the course of the supplication to the corresponding event in the life of Christ, rather than that which connects it with the life of the Virgin. The first collect is—

"Almighty and everliving God, we humbly beseech thy Majesty, that, as thy only-begotten Son was this day presented in the temple in substance of our flesh, so we may be presented unto thee with pure and clean hearts, by the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

Where you observe the subject of the prayer is *the Presentation of Christ in the Temple*. The second collect is—

"We beseech thee, O Lord, pour thy grace into our hearts ; that, as we have known the incarnation of thy Son Jesus Christ by the message of an angel, so by his cross and passion we may be brought unto the glory of his resurrection ; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

Where you observe that the subject of the prayer

is the *Incarnation of our Lord*. In both instances, then, we honour and keep in memory the Virgin, through and by means of the worship which we give to our Lord Christ; His presentation in the temple corresponding with her purification, and His incarnation being the great doctrine of Christianity kept in memory by the annunciation made to the holy Virgin; while at the same time, even her very name, though the day is dedicated to her memory, is entirely omitted in both collects.

In a similar manner it happens, that in many places of our Liturgy we record the Virgin's name, but always in conjunction with, and tributary to, that of our Lord; as in the hymn *Te Deum*: "When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb;" and in the Creed: "Born of the Virgin Mary;" where all the reference is to Christ. The only other place in our service where mention is made of her, is in the hymn "*Magnificat*," called there "The Song of the blessed Virgin Mary." This hymn we repeat in our Evening Service; and though of course no one can repeat that hymn—"He hath regarded the lowliness of his handmaiden: for behold, from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed;" though no one can repeat that hymn without calling to mind the memory of that holy and humble handmaiden who speaks, still it is quite clear that our Church desires no more than her memory; for just observe, together with a

record of her blessedness is a record of her *lowliness*, and if we praise her at all, it is not for her glory, but for her humility. It is for that glorious event which accompanied and followed the singing of that hymn—"He remembering his mercy hath holpen his servant Israel, as he promised to our forefathers Abraham and his seed for ever:" but—"Glory be to the FATHER, and to the SON, and to the HOLY GHOST."

Thus much, then, for our own Church;—a sincere veneration, honour, and memorial observance of the blessed Virgin, such as is consistent with that peculiar and miraculous relationship in which she stood to our Lord. She is joined with all other saints, and celebrated in union with them, in the common fellowship of the invisible Church; and perhaps even beyond other saints, her whole life being something peculiar and wonderful, in the mystery of God incarnate. We can speak of her as we cannot of other saints, in the language of Elizabeth: "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb;" and we can call her, as Elizabeth did, "The Mother of our Lord." We can look upon her,—as of necessity she must have been, filled with all virtue, purity, goodness, and all the peculiar graces and beauties of her sex,—we can look upon her with a love approaching to silent wonder, in the thought of what she must have been to have heard the words of the angel: "Hail thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is

with thee. Blessed art thou among women." What she must have been to have borne within her the holy babe Jesus, to have brought him forth, to have nourished him, to have reared him as an infant, to have been so much about him, and with him, and he with her, as a child with a parent. We can contemplate her joy, her half-formed hopes, her wonder in feeling, as she must have done, that the holy babe was not as other babes; that as he grew from infancy to manhood, she was not a mother to Him as other mothers are, and yet a mother; that as she would impart to him his lessons of childhood, she would have authority over him as of a mother, and he be subject to her, as we know he was, as to a mother, and yet withal he was her God. All these things, wonderful and beautiful,—and the more you think of them, the more wonderful and beautiful they are,—must excite the thoughts of any contemplative person towards the memory of that blessed Virgin, who in the councils of God was called upon for this mysterious office. But here we stop; I have gone to the very verge of all that can be said. Respect, love, veneration, a sort of wonderful admiration and memory,—this is the very verge of all that we would say. Thus much we delight to say. More we dare not.

But how different the Church of Rome. In addition to the two simple festivals which our Church commemorates upon the Scriptural

grounds just mentioned, Rome has invented three, of which there is no mention or authority whatever, either in Scripture or the primitive Church. The first is the Miraculous Conception of the blessed Virgin; the second is the Nativity; and the third, which is perhaps one of the greatest festivals in their Church, the *Assumption*, *i. e.* the taking up of the body of the Virgin into heaven. This festival is celebrated on the 15th of August; and in the Breviary we find continual allusions as to a well-authenticated fact, that the body of the Virgin, many years after death, was taken out of the tomb, and carried by angels into heaven. In parts of the service it is said that “Mary the Virgin is taken up;” “The holy Mother of God is taken up above the choirs of angels into the heavenly kingdoms.” And in the sixth Lection, after comparing her with Eve,—Eve having brought misery into the world, but the Virgin joy—it is said: “She conceived the Son of God,—she brought him forth without any pain,—she consecrated herself entirely to God,—how could the lower regions receive her,—how could corruption attack that body in which *Life* was received. A straight, a level, and an easy path, was prepared for her to heaven.” Now this account of the assumption of the body of the Virgin is no doubt very important to the Romanist. We do not wonder that they should make much of it in their Church, and establish it as an article of faith

among their people, and for this reason,—that if once the mind could be thoroughly impressed with a belief in the fact, those prayers and adorations which follow would be the readier received. Could we but embrace it as an article of faith, that this wonderful miracle had been wrought, and that, imitating the ascension of our Lord, his Virgin mother was after death carried up into heaven, and now reigns with him above the choirs of angels, then all these extravagant expressions of praise and worship in which their Church indulges, would be intelligible, calling her, as they do, “Star of the Sea”—“Queen of Heaven”—“The refuge of sinners,” and the like.* But the truth is, that it is a mere popish legend. Let us look to Scripture—we find it silent. Let us look to the early Fathers—we find them silent. Who were the witnesses of this wonderful thing?

* The following are some of the titles or methods of address adopted in the course of prayers to the Virgin: “Blessed Mother,” “Glorious Queen of the World,” “Chaste Virgin,” “Blessed Mother of God,” “Perpetual Virgin,” “Temple of God,” “Abode of the Holy Spirit,” “Queen of Angels,” “Queen of Saints,” “Queen of the Heavens,” “Mystical Rose,” “Tower of Ivory,” “House of Gold,” “Arc of the Covenant,” “Sweet Virgin Mary,” “Mother of Mercy,” “Our Hope,” “Our Advocate,” “Our Life,” “Our Sweetness.” And these, remember, in their public formularies. The expressions which frequently occur in their private writers are so shocking and blasphemous, that I cannot record them in these pages; sufficient will it be to say, that there is no end of extravagance, in every sense of the word, from which they abstain.

No one answers. As to the death of Mary—even her *death*, much more her assumption—there is no word in Scripture. Once after the ascension of our Lord we find Mary described promiscuously with others, and after that the Scripture is entirely silent regarding her. Some writers maintain that she died at Ephesus, others at Jerusalem. As to the time, some have mentioned the year 48, others later, but none have given a period subsequent to the closing of the canon of Scripture; so that we might reasonably say, if the body of the blessed Virgin had been so translated to heaven,—if the miracle had need to be recognized among Christians as containing anything essential to true doctrine,—the Scriptures would have led us to its consideration, would have recorded it. But nothing is said. Nothing is heard of it for the first four centuries. We cast it aside, therefore, with many other popish legends, as a worthless fable, unworthy the regard of any Christian man.*

* There could not be a better example of the distinction between ourselves and Rome in matters of tradition, than in the fable of the Assumption of the Virgin. Many examples were given in Sermon IV, of the way in which our own Church accepts a tradition, when *confirmed by Scripture, and proved by Scripture*; but here is an example of a tradition asserted by Rome, and believed by her, but rejected by us. The ground of our rejection is, first, the utter silence of Scripture. And then this is followed up by an examination of history, in which we find a *beginning* for it,—namely, the close of the third century. Now a tradition that has any beginning except in the apostles, is not a tradition worthy to be assumed as an article of faith.

So much then for the Romish festivals in honour of the Virgin : and if this be their foundation, we ought not to be surprised to find a superstructure of adoration and worship in proportion. In describing the adoration given to the other saints and to the angels, I described it as consisting of four different degrees, increasing from the lowest to the highest, until it amounted to a positive idolatrous worship. You will find precisely the same in the worship of the Virgin ; only, if possible, with more peculiarity in attributing a mediation to her, superior if anything, to that of Jesus Christ himself. Let us begin from the lowest. The lowest stage is that wherein a prayer is made to God to permit the prayer of the saint to avail before Him, as in the following, on the feast of the Assumption :—" We beseech thee, O Lord, pardon the crimes of thy servants, that we, who cannot please Thee by our own actions, may be saved by the intercession of the mother of Thy Son our Lord." The next stage was that wherein mention is made of *merits*, that the saint's virtuous life or glorious martyrdom, might be efficacious in God's sight, to bring down forgiveness. As in the following :—" By the prayers and *merits* of the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, and of all saints, may the Lord bring us to the kingdom of heaven." The next stage is that wherein the prayer is no longer offered to God, but directly to the saint ; praying that the saint would use his or

her influence with God, to bring down some blessing that might be asked for. As in the following :—"Holy Mary, pray for us,—“ Holy Virgin, pray for us.” “Come *thou advocate*, turn thy compassionate eyes upon us, and show to us Jesus the blessed fruit of thy womb, O sweet Virgin Mary.” And the fourth or last stage, was that wherein—the name of God being entirely omitted—the saint is personally addressed, as having the actual power and authority to grant the blessing which is demanded ; and it is this latter sort which constitutes the positive idolatry of the worship. The other three might *possibly* (though even they with very great difficulty) be explained, but this, from the fact of the omission of the name of God, and substituting another in the place of God, can be described by no other name than idolatry ; and yet these sort of addresses abound in the worship of Rome, when addressed to the Virgin. For instance :—"O generous Mary, beautiful above all, obtain pardon for us,—apply grace unto us,—prepare glory for us,—hail, thou rose, thou Virgin Mary. Grant unto us wisdom, and with the elect to enjoy grace, that we may with melody praise thee, and *do thou drive our sins away.*"*

This prayer occurs in a book called “The Hours of the Blessed Virgin ;” and the following, of a similar character, occurs in “The Rosary :” “Thou repairer and saviour of the despairing soul, dispenser of spiritual grace, that which I require,

* See also the Appendix, p. 470.

that which I sigh for, grant unto me; heal my wounds, and grant unto my mind, which prays unto thee, the gifts of thy grace." The following occurs in the Litany of the blessed Virgin, and to the repetition of it, indulgences were granted by many of the popes: "We fly to thy protection, holy mother of God, despise not our prayers in our necessities, but deliver us at all times from all evils, glorious and blessed Virgin."

Many others might be cited of like effect. Both the Breviary and other authorised books of devotion, abound with them. These, however, will be sufficient to explain the idolatrous tendency of the worship offered.

But now I turn from these public records of the Church, to the sayings and writings of private individuals. It is true that we have no right (generally speaking) to charge upon the whole Church the opinions of any individual. Individuals, they say, may err. To which we reply: Our doctrine is, that not only individuals may err, but also *Churches* may err; but since it is the doctrine of Rome that her Church cannot err—if we bring forward any writings or prayers directed to be used notoriously and openly by any individual, and find that the Church, by any public act, has given her public approbation of that individual, then the Church becomes justly chargeable with the imputation of those doctrines. On this ground let us take the writings of Bonaventura.

He was a canonized saint of Rome. For his life and for his writings he received the highest meed of approbation that his Church had to bestow, and is made himself one of those saints to whom prayers may be addressed.

Now this saint being thus deliberately pronounced worthy the Church's adoration, it follows that his doctrines and his teaching must be approved by her: whatever is found in him, may fairly be attributed to her. With this view let me inform you of certain things which Bonaventura has written and publicly taught. In the first place, he has taken the whole Psalter—the hundred and fifty Psalms of David,—and made a new version of them, with this remarkable interpolation: wherever he found the name of *God* or *Lord*, he has changed it into *Lady*. And thus to our horror we find, that whatever titles of adoration were by David intended for God, are by Bonaventura attributed to the *Virgin*.* Thus, for instance: in the sixty-seventh Psalm the words of David are: “Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered:” but the words of the Lady-Psalter are: “Let Mary arise, and let her enemies be scattered.” In the hundred and thirtieth Psalm the words of David are: “Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord:”

* This book is entitled, “The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin, compiled by the seraphical Doctor St. Bonaventura, Bishop of Alba, and Presbyter Cardinal of the Holy Church of Rome.”

Bonaventura substitutes, "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lady ; O Lady, hear my voice, let thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplications." In the hundred and fortieth Psalm, where David calls upon the creatures of heaven and earth to praise the living God, Bonaventura changes it all, and says, "Praise our lady in heaven, glorify her in the highest ; praise her all ye men and cattle, ye birds of heaven and fishes of the sea ; praise her all ye legions of angels, praise her all ye spirits above." But this is not all. Not only has he changed the Psalter in this way, but also many other of the hymns and canticles of Scripture in the same manner ; particularly the "Te Deum." It almost shocks me to use the words, but I *must* use them, to show you the dreadful extent to which this blasphemous fancy was carried. Every one knows the "Te Deum"—"We praise Thee, O God."—It is thus changed : "We praise thee, O Lady, we acknowledge thee Mary the Virgin ; all the earth doth worship thee, spouse of the eternal Father." And then going on : "Holy, holy, holy, Mary parent, mother of God, and Virgin ; O lady, save thy people. Let thy great mercy be with us, because we do put our trust in thee, O Virgin Mary ; in thee, sweet Mary, do we put our trust, defend thou us eternally." In the same way the Athanasian Creed is paraphrased, and the Song of the three Children, and many places of the pro-

phets; and above all, there is a Litany expressly made for her. And where we say, as in *our* Litany, "Spare us, good Lord," it is said, "Spare us, good Lady," and "Good Lady, deliver us," and "We sinners do beseech thee to hear us, good Lady."

This is enough for Bonaventura. Other writers are not behind-hand in following this example, particularly Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence. Among other things, he takes many of those passages of Scripture, which describe so emphatically the advocacy, atonement, and mediation of Christ, and deliberately transfers them to the Virgin. For instance: the Apostle St. John says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world."* But this writer says, "Christ is not our advocate alone, but our judge; and since the just is scarce secure, how shall a sinner go to him, as to an advocate? Therefore God hath provided for us an *advocatess*, who is gentle and sweet, in whom there is found nothing that is sharp."† Upon the words of St. Paul, "Come boldly to the throne of grace," he says, "Mary is the throne of grace, to her, therefore, let us come with boldness, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in time of

* 1 John ii. 1, 2.

† Sum. part. iv. lit. xv.

need." "Mary is called full of grace, because she is the means and *cause* of *grace*, by transferring grace to all mankind." And this is not all. This fancy of taking texts of Scripture, and converting them from their original application to Christ, into a secondary application to the Virgin, seems to have been a very favourite pursuit among them. The well-known passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, is thus misused: "He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant," &c. &c. "She made herself of no reputation, after the example of her Son, and took upon her the form of a handmaid, . . . wherefore God hath highly exalted her, giving her a name above every name, that *at the name of Mary* every knee should bow."* And another writer takes the text of Acts iv. 12, "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," &c., and renders it thus: "There is no name under heaven, after the name of Jesus, whereby we can be saved, but the name of Mary." And then he adds, "In all temptations and infirmities of the soul, and in all infirmities of the body, the holy name of Mary is our only remedy and refuge; neither was there ever any one in such tribulation, that upon devout invocation of her, did not find present help."†

The same doctrine is found in many others.

* Rich. a S. Laurentio, lib. iv. De Laud. Virgin.

† Vincentius Brunus, Meditat. ii. De Beat. Virgin. p. 62.

Bernardin: "Of so great authority in the heavenly palace, is that empress, that, omitting all other intermediate saints, we may appeal to her for every grievance."* And again, Biel, commenting on the canon of the Mass: "You are afraid to approach the *Father*, frightened by only hearing of Him, but He gave you Jesus for a mediator: what could not such a Son obtain from such a Father? But are you afraid to approach even him? he is your brother and your flesh, tempted through all, that he might become merciful. This brother Mary gave to you. But perhaps even in him you fear the Divine Majesty, because, although he was made man, yet he remained God; you wish to have an advocate even to him. Betake yourself to Mary, for in Mary is pure humanity. The Son surely will hear the Mother, and the Father will hear the Son.†" In the latter passage you observe, that the distinction is made between Christ and the Virgin, on the score of facility of access; God and Jesus Christ are esteemed harsh and severe, Mary gentle and merciful. In this same spirit another writer says, that the two names of Jesus and Mary, may be compared to salt and honey. "Salt, which answers to Christ's name, is more wholesome, and in respect of its preservative quality, more efficacious; yet for all that, it seems to be more sharp

* Bernardin de Bustis. *Mariale*, part iii. Serm. ii. p. 176.

† Biel. On the Canon of the Mass, lect. xxxii.

and pungent. So the name of Jesus, however you take it, sounds something of a judging majesty, by reason of his divinity ; but the name of Mary is in every way all sweetness. It is honey, preserving from corruption, but not biting. And then this writer concludes : “ *The name of Mary to us affords a sweeter taste than that of her Son.*”*

But these are comparatively writers of an early date. Let us come at once to modern times. Do we find these same doctrines still flourishing in the Church of Rome at the present day ? We do, most assuredly. Let us turn to an encyclical letter addressed by Pope Gregory XVI, so late as the year 1832 : “ We hasten unto you, venerable brethren, and as a sign of our good will towards you, we address this letter on this most joyful day, when we solemnize the festival of the triumphant assumption of the holy Virgin ; that *She*, whom we have acknowledged our *patroness* and *deliverer amongst the greatest calamities*, may propitiously assist us while we write, and by *her celestial inspiration*, may guide us to such counsels, as may be most salutary to the Christian Church.”

Now here is the Virgin Mary set in the place of God. It is *her* patronage that the pope invokes,—it is *her* guidance that he looks to, that he may be assisted in his writing,—it is *her* inspiration that he trusts may lead him to good

† Barthol. de los Rios.

counsels,—all which points, we should have thought a Christian would have asked of God. But still later than this: we find a work published so late as the year 1841, in which there is an account given of the lives of certain saints who had been canonized in the year 1839. One of the saints, Alphonsus Liguori, is thus described in this work: “While he was preaching on the patronage of the blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers to recur with confidence to her in all their wants, he suddenly exclaimed: ‘O ye are too cold in praying to our blessed lady, I will pray to her for you.’ He then knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his eyes raised to heaven, and was seen by all present, lifted more than a foot from the ground, and turned towards an image of the blessed Virgin near the pulpit. The countenance of our lady darted forth beams of light which shone upon the face of the ecstatic Alphonsus. This spectacle lasted about five or six minutes, during which the people cried out, ‘A miracle, a miracle,’ and every one burst into a flood of tears. But the saint, rising up, exclaimed in a loud voice, ‘Be glad, for the blessed Virgin has granted your prayer.’” Again, in a work published by this very saint, in Italian, but translated into English in the year 1837, at Dublin, we find the following passage: “Queen of heaven and earth, Mother of God, my sovereign Mistress, I present myself before you as a poor mendicant before a

mighty queen : no grace, no pardon, emanates from the throne of the King of kings, *without passing through the hands of Mary* (according to St. Bernard). The plenitude of grace is found in Jesus Christ as the head whence it flows to Mary, who communicates it to all his members. No doubt, Jesus the Man-God, alone sufficed to effect our redemption ; but it was more convenient that both sexes having concurred to our ruin, both should conspire to save us. Albertus Magnus styles Mary the *coadjutrix of our redemption*. All is subject to Mary's empire, EVEN GOD HIMSELF ! Jesus has rendered Mary omnipotent. The one is omnipotent by nature, the other is omnipotent by grace."*

Now here let us remember, that this is written in a book, published in our own language in the year 1837, in the metropolis of Ireland, and in circulation among the Romanists at this very moment. Let us also remember, that its author, for so writing, has been only a few years since canonized as a saint ; and thus his doctrines have received the stamp of the whole Church. We are justified then in saying, that these are the sentiments which the Church of Rome now approves ; they are the doctrines which she still would hold and still would teach. I need not say more. A volume might be filled with extracts from their

* "Glories of Mary," translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus Liguori by a Catholic [Roman] Priest. *Dublin*, 1837.

private books of devotion, and from writers of the present day. It is vain that they shift their ground; they are surrounded on all sides,—they cannot escape. The blessed Virgin Mary has been taken by them from that proper position which she held in the Church Catholic, as a holy woman ever to be remembered with peculiar respect and memory, and has been elevated into a positive goddess. Worship is given to her even as to God,—prayers are addressed to her,—titles of dignity, investing her even with a precedence before our Lord himself, are bestowed upon her. The mind is so captivated by some strange fascination in this worship, that it seems as if the Almighty suffered men to go astray into this wickedness, for the hardness of their hearts. What can be the end of it? They have forsaken the living God, and set up Mary in His place;—they have forsaken the mediation of Christ, and set up Mary in His place;—they have forsaken the Holy Ghost, and set up Mary in His place;—they deserve almost to be stigmatized as a sect, and, as Bishop Bull says, to be called *MARIANI*, rather than *CHRISTIANI*.* We really know not which most to wonder at, their blindness, or their sin.

And now, my brethren, I have shown you, I trust, quite sufficiently, the fact of this Virgin-worship attaching to the Romish persuasion. Two duties remain for me. First, to examine Scrip-

* Bishop Bull, *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 174.

ture, and to see whether there be any arguments there, which would throw light upon the subject ; and secondly, the writings of the fathers. By the fathers, I mean those of the early ages ; for if the worship had in early times been a Christian custom, there would certainly be in those fathers some allusion to it.

First then, Scripture : Of course all those texts applying to the general principle of divine worship will apply here also. The Scripture does not draw any distinction between Latreia and Duleia, —it does not imagine one class of beings to be adored with one sort of worship, and another with another ; therefore we shall find nothing applying to such points as these. We have in the Bible, one broad line of God's commandment : "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." But passing by these general texts, let us go at once to those Scriptures of the New Testament, where mention *would have been made* of such a worship, if it had ever been contemplated. Let us examine those places where the life and actions of the Virgin Mary are recorded, particularly those in which she is concerned with our blessed Lord, and endeavour to see with what sort of feeling He himself and the apostles, regarded her throughout her life.

The first occasion in which we hear of the Virgin Mary, is of course that account given in the evangelist, regarding the birth of Christ, in

which all the expressions that are used, amount to no more than this : “Blessed art thou among women,” “Hail, thou that art highly favoured,” “The Lord is with thee,” and the like. She is always called all through Scripture, either simply “Mary,” or “Mary the mother of Jesus.” On one occasion, by Elizabeth, “The mother of my Lord.” On other occasions, as by the angel to Joseph, “Mary thy wife,” or “The young Child’s mother.” Now in none of these places, nor in any of the addresses made to her either by the Magi or the angels, or her treatment by Joseph, is anything said from which we could infer, that any power or authority, or anything approaching worship, was ever intended for her.

After these earlier transactions we find our Lord at the age of twelve years questioning the doctors in the temple,—when Mary spoke, saying, in a sort of rebuke: “Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.” There is nothing said, as though Mary were a person in any way beyond the relationship of an *earthly* parent. His answer implies this. “I must be about my Father’s business,—*spiritual* business, of which you as an earthly being can have no cognizance.” Just so again in the marriage of Cana in Galilee,—when the mother of Jesus spake concerning the wine, he addresses her again, as though only an earthly woman and no more: “Woman, what have I to do with thee, mine hour is not yet come.” The

words here are very remarkable : “ What have I to do with *thee* ? ” She had asked him to exercise his miraculous power,—she had attempted to use the privilege of a mother in requesting of her Son an exercise of his divinity,—but she is rejected : “ What have I to do with thee.” Which is equivalent to this,—though in *earthly* things we have a relationship, in spiritual and heavenly things we have none.* Again, in that passage where his mother and his brethren seek for him in the crowd, and one said “ Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee.” If his mother had then stood or was ever intended to stand, in the light of a person superior to others ; if she had been, or was intended to be, in the counsels of God, by reason of her relationship to Christ, an object of religious worship,—surely then would have been the time, in which our Lord would have enforced the doctrine. But what said he ? He put aside all claims of any sort appertaining to relationship ;—his mother, and his brethren, he said, were not to be known or marked by any ties of *earthly* kindred : “ My mother and my brethren

* Epiphanius cites this text as a Scripture proof against the heresy of the Collyridians. “ The Gospel warned us beforehand, in which Christ thus speaketh : ‘ What have I to do with thee, woman ? my hour is not yet come ; ’ in order that from this expression, ‘ What have I to do with thee, *woman* ? ’ none might think the holy Virgin more excellent ; or by excessively admiring that saint, fall into the folly of this heresy.”—*Epiphanius*, Hæres. lxxix. tom. ii. Oper. p. 1061.

are those who hear the word of God and do it." And again, in a similar way,—when a certain woman looked upon him, and in her admiration said: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked,"—he turned away from the earthly relationship just as before; he would not suffer their minds even to dwell on such a subject;—he seemed as it were prophetically to foresee the time, when such a misuse of earthly relationship with his mother would produce the evils of Romanism, and he said: "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Exactly the same answer as before. There is something remarkable in this; why should the very same words be used? It is as it were marking most emphatically the danger of any superstitious reverence of the Virgin: "Keep away from such a notion. Mind not earthly things. Look not on my mother as anything, as far as earthly things go, but look to the spirit."

After this there is only one more scene in which the Virgin mother and our Lord appear together, and that is at the awful moment of his crucifixion. She was standing by the side of the cross, and St. John was standing there also. He beheld his mother,—he knew that he was about to die,—he foresaw that his end was near. What an opportunity then to impart the doctrine (if it were true), that men in after ages should adore that mother with divine worship. He saw all before him in

prophetic vision,—he had told all his apostles that his hour was come. There was the apostle who was to be one of the evangelists,—the one whom he loved, the one whom he appointed to record all things necessary to salvation ; and yet his voice is utterly silent on any such subject ;—He *does speak*,—he commends his mother to the apostle, and he commends the apostle to his mother, so that his thoughts *were* directed towards his mother, which makes the argument still stronger than if he had been quite silent,—He *does speak*, but his command merely refers to her *earthly* provision, and then it is said : “ That disciple took her unto his own home.” And what happened after this ? Once only is she mentioned again in the book of the Acts ; she is mentioned as being present with the brethren of Jesus and the apostles, but nothing more is given than the mere fact of her presence, and after this, a total silence is observed all through Scripture. There were many opportunities. St. John wrote his Gospel many years after these events,—he wrote also epistles, and he wrote the Apocalypse, and yet on no one occasion does he ever mention even the name of the Virgin, though so committed to him by his Lord, nor do the other apostles and writers ever mention her,—neither St. Paul,* nor St. James, nor St. Peter, nor St. Jude. All is silence.

* St. Paul once alludes to the Messiah as “ *made of a woman*.” (Gal. iv. 4.) But in this expression, he evidently loses sight of the individual in the class or race—*woman*. If the Virgin had

Now is this likely to have been the case, if the blessed Virgin had been intended by our Lord to be, with himself, an object of adoration ? It is quite impossible. The evidence from Scripture in this case arises from its silence ;—its silence must be, to a candid and impartial mind, quite conclusive on such an important question as the present. Omitting all those passages, which were before quoted as applying to the worship of *saints*,—but taking the question simply as standing by itself in the peculiar worship of the Virgin Mary,—it is quite clear, that the silence of Scripture, is at once an evidence against it. Where there is a general law laid down as a rule of action, that general law never can be violated, except from a counter-acting law *from the same authority*. If circumstances should arise, by which an exception to the general law might be made, that exception would be marked out so signally and clearly that no man might mistake. God's general law is : “Thou shalt worship, fall down before, make a mediator of, say prayers to—no being whatsoever save *me*.” If there were intended to be any exception, it would be surely recorded. If the Virgin Mary had been intended to be an exception, we should have been told so. We are not told so. The silence therefore of Scripture condemns the doctrine.

been prominent as an object of worship, he could not thus have spoken, or he would, according to his manner, have said something in a parenthesis of the honour due unto that woman. But

II. But we have a second point—*Antiquity*. Do we find in any of the fathers of the first four centuries any mention of this worship as belonging to Christians? We do not find one. Just as in Scripture, their evidence is from their silence. We have writers of every kind,—historians, commentators, writers of epistles, apologists; and yet in no single author is it asserted that the Virgin Mary was an object of worship among them. Many opportunities occur, where it would have been mentioned; as, for instance, *Ignatius* frequently mentions Mary as the mother of Christ, and yet a virgin,—but he does not call her even “Blessed,” but simply “the Virgin.” In *Justin Martyr*, the same. In *Tertullian*, so far from speaking of her with any high attributes of honour, he makes a very singular remark, which would be quite incompatible with any notion of her as an object of worship. He speaks thus: “The brothers of the Lord had not believed on him. . . . His mother likewise is not shown to have adhered to him, whereas other Marias and Marthas were frequently in his company.”* In the same manner, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, and many others. They all describe the Virgin,—speak of her as the chaste Virgin, the holy Virgin, the Mother of God, and the like; but never breathe a hint of anything appertaining to adoration.

he is silent. See further, on the silence of Scripture traced in the history of Jesus, in Bishop Bull’s Sermons,—Sermon IV.

* *De Carne Christi*, Paris, 1675, vii. p. 315.

But if there is this remarkable silence for the period of three centuries and a half, when we get beyond that, we do then find an occasional allusion to it. It was about this period (A.D. 370) that the first sect of Christians arose who wished to deify the Virgin. These were called Collyridians, and consisted principally of women. They took that name from their custom of offering cakes to the object of their worship. Now against this sect, Epiphanius, who flourished at that period, wrote very frequently. In one place he says: "Which of the prophets ever permitted a man to be worshipped? not to speak of a woman. Let Mary be in honour; but let Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, only be worshipped. *Let no one worship Mary.* That service is not enjoined by God. Not even the angels are worthy of such honours."* And again: "Let such women as worship her be silenced by Jeremiah, and no longer disturb the world. Let them not say, '*We honour the Queen of Heaven.*' Let Mary be in honour. Let the Lord be *worshipped.*'"† If Epiphanius had been alive at the present day, he could not have used words more apposite. He foretells, as it were, the very title that Romanists now so abundantly apply to their favoured saint—"Queen of Heaven." But again, *St. Ambrose*

* Epiphan. Hæres. lxxix. tom. ii. Oper. p. 1061, as cited by Mr. Palmer, in his fifth letter to Wiseman.

† Idem, p. 1066.

says (A.D. 380): "Lest any one should offer the same adoration to the Virgin Mary,—Mary was the temple of God, but not the God of the temple; and therefore He only is to be adored who operated in that temple."*

And now, my brethren, what need is there to say more? Our proof is complete. We have a right to charge our Romanist brethren upon these premises: first, with a violation of Scripture; and secondly, with a violation of antiquity. We have a right to say, according to the words of our twenty-second article, that "the Romish doctrine concerning worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints is a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

It is a "*fond thing*," that is, a *foolish* thing; for what advantage or benefit can there be in it? What is there to a Christian hindering him from approaching God in a direct supplication? Is God a cruel and merciless task-master, ruling his children with a rod of iron, and withdrawing himself from their view as never to be approached? Yes, says the Romanist, He is. They invest God with all the attributes of harshness, severity, and justice. They teach themselves to look upon Him, as of necessity exacting his due in punishment to the uttermost farthing, and as sending forth fearful

* Ambrose de Spiritu Sancto, lib. iii. c. ii. p. 681. Ed. Bened.

woes upon the fallen children of men ; and so they fear to approach Him to deprecate his anger, and shrink from his presence, as from one whose wrath is a consuming fire.* And to a certain degree they do rightly. “God *is* a consuming fire.” But then, that was to the *world*, not to the Christian. The spirit of Christianity would teach us, that at the same time God is a God of justice, He is also a God of mercy. If his wrath is terrible, yet his mercy is infinite. “The Lord is long suffering, full of compassion, slow to anger, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” Now, if there is any one thing peculiar in Christianity as demonstrating this long suffering,—if there is anything by which we learn how to bring together and make harmonious two attributes which might seem incompatible,—Justice demanding with exact severity an account for every sin, and Mercy offering a full pardon to every sinner,—it is that wonderful event by which God became incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, and so brought it to pass, that when man could never, by reason of his sins, approach unto God, yet God, by reason of his mercy, effected a way by which He himself could approach unto man. The overture not being in man’s power, as being a sinner past hope, behold it came from God. From the bosom of the Father came forth the

* Thus the contrast between Jesus and Mary, as given at p. 449 ; and see the Hymns in Appendix.

only begotten Son. He approached the fallen race. He offered peace. He said, cancel the past. God's justice will be satisfied in ME. Him whom you could not see, because "the earth shook and trembled, the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken, because he was wroth. He made darkness his secret place; his pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies." *Him*, whom for sin you could not perceive, yet now you behold in ME. Him, of whom you would not dare to ask a single prayer, nor know how to address a single word, you may address in ME. For I am in Him, and He is in me; and therefore he saith, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." He maketh no limit. "*Whatsoever.*" "If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." And again, in another place, he saith: "This is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask *anything* according to His will, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him." He maketh no limit. "*Anything.*"

Is it not then a "*fond thing*" to go to another? a "*fond thing*" to set up a Virgin saint? a mediator to a mediator;—another name besides His name;—another will besides His will;—another step of approach to get unto Him, who came himself to make God in *Him* so near unto us, that we

might see him, handle him, and hear Him as the word of Life. Is it not a "*fond thing*" when God says, "There shall be one step between you and me," that men should say, "We will have two;"—that when God says, "there shall be one mediator between you and me, the man Christ Jesus," that men should say, "We will have another, the woman Mary;"—that when God says, "You shall have a high-priest touched with the feelings of your own infirmities, therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace," that men should turn round, and say, "We will come timidly, fearfully, circuitously, distrustfully." This is indeed a "*fond thing*."

But moreover it is a blasphemous thing. I would not use a harsh word, but I would say it is a blasphemous thing in the proper sense of the word blasphemy, that is, the saying or doing anything injurious to God's honour. Jesus Christ is God. Though he came to be a teacher, a mediator, and an atonement, yet he also was God. He therefore is Omnipotent, sufficient in himself. He "knoweth what is in man." But the setting up of the Virgin Mary in parallel lines with Jesus, as a mediator or advocate, or requester of prayers, or hearer of prayers is robbing the Lord Jesus Christ of the prerogative due unto his name. It is injurious in the highest sense to his honour. And consider the way, the very extraordinary way in which this has been done. She is set up, not only as a parallel

mediator, but in many senses as a superior mediator. In the hymn sung to the Virgin, it is thus said: "*Monstra te esse matrem*,"*—"Show that thou art a mother,"—that is, "exert the influence of a mother to obtain what thou askest." Many prayers and addresses might be quoted in which similar language is found. It is the usual spirit of their adoration. "She approaches (say they) that golden tribunal of divine majesty, not asking, but *commanding*; not a handmaid, but a *mistress*."† And again: "Mary prays as a daughter, requests as a sister, *commands* as a mother."‡ Again: "Since the Virgin Mary is Mother of God, and God is her Son,—and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject to her, and the mother is preferred above, and is superior to her son,—it follows that the *blessed Virgin is herself superior to God*, and God himself is her subject, by reason of the humanity derived from her."§ Are not these, my brethren, fearful things to think of? A human creature thus to be exalted above God. A mere play upon the words *mother* and *son*, taken from an earthly relationship, and made into a doctrine, conveying a notion that Jesus, as

* These words occur in the hymn "*Ave Maris Stella*," used on all Festivals dedicated to the Virgin. See Appendix.

† Peter Damiani.

‡ Albertus Magnus.

§ Bernardin, as cited in Mr. Tyler's valuable work on "*Primitive Christian Worship*," to which the reader should refer, if desirous of further examples to show the full extent to which this notion can be carried.

to his *divinity*, must be subject to his mother in her *humanity*. It is either, as before observed, blasphemy or folly; blasphemy in robbing our Lord of his divinity, or folly in imagining that his humanity could be looked upon in heaven as still the same humanity which he bore when upon earth; whereas we know that his humanity is now "*glorified*,"—"exalted,"—"above every name,"—"all things being under his feet." Yet this is the common tenor of their prayers, and the whole principle of their Virgin worship. It is indeed revolting to our feelings, destructive of our religion, and injurious to the supremacy of our God.

The more we dwell upon this miserable scene,—the more we search into Romanist writers, and witness the Romish practices connected with this subject,—the rather we shall come to a conclusion, that there must be in this worship of the Virgin, a degree of darkness upon the human intellect, suffered by Almighty God to overwhelm, and cause to wander, learning, wisdom, and intelligence, otherwise the acutest and the most devotional in the history of the human race. I cannot in any other way account for the grossness of perversion which the details of this idolatry present to us. I have quoted to you but a very small portion of the evidence which might have been deduced. Much more, and much worse, remains behind,—worse in practice, worse in doctrine; and I cannot attribute it to anything save a devia-

tion from right reason, permitted to exist by Almighty God for a time, for some wise and ulterior purpose known only to Himself.

If so, they who are thus afflicted need our commiseration, rather than our anger;—our prayers, rather than our arguments. Prayer is a weapon to which Catholics have had but small recourse, in their controversy with Rome. Let us henceforth, as a Church, have more frequent and more earnest recourse to it. It is one of the strongest in the armoury of God. Let us remember Rome in our PRAYERS. Let us pray for the light of truth to shine more abundantly upon the darkness of her ways, so that she may have a clearer insight into God's holy word, a more faithful interpretation of His will, and a readier desire to impart it in its full integrity to her people. They will forgive us, when we are compelled by truth to speak of them harshly, if we at the same time pray for them sincerely; and let us also forgive them for the many heavy anathemas under which they have cut us off from their communion, when by the voice of prayer, as brother interceding for brother (the bitterness of controversy being set aside), our voice shall go up to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, for Peace, for Righteousness, for Unity, and for Truth.

APPENDIX.

ROMISH HYMNS DEDICATED TO THE VIRGIN MARY.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| “ Gaude, matrona cœlica! | Rejoice, O heavenly Mother! |
| Tu, <i>ancillam</i> Jesu Christi, | Thou, “ <i>the handmaid</i> ” of Jesus Christ, |
| Te vocare voluisti. | Didst wish to call thyself. |
| Sed ut docet lux divina, | But, as the divine light teacheth, |
| Tu illius es <i>Domina</i> , | Thou art his “ MISTRESS,” |
| Nam lex jubet et ratio | For law and reason tell us |
| <i>Matrem</i> preesse filio. | THAT THE MOTHER IS ABOVE THE SON. |
| Ergo ora suppliciter | Therefore pray suppliantly |
| Et <i>præcipe</i> sublimiter | And <i>command</i> with authority, |
| Ut nos in mundi vespera | That when we come to the evening of |
| | the world, |
| Ad regna ducat supera.* | He may bring us to his kingdom above. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| “ Reparatrix et Salvatrix | O thou Repairer and SAVIOUR |
| Desperandis animæ, | To those despairing in soul, |
| Irroratrix et largitrix | Dew-giver and bestower |
| Spiritualis gratiæ, | Of spiritual grace, |
| Quod requiro, quod suspiro, | As I require and sigh after, |
| Mea sana vulnera, | Heal my wounds ; |
| Et da menti te poscenti | Give to the mind that prays to thee |
| Gratiarum munera.”† | The gifts of grace. |

The above may be said to be of a private nature ; but the following occurs in the *Breviary*, and is publicly used in all the festivals of the Virgin :

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| “ Ave, Maris Stella ! | Hail, Star of the Sea ! |
| Dei Mater alma, | Hail, Mother of God |
| Atque semper Virgo, | And ever Virgin, |
| Felix Cœli Porta ! | Happy Gate of Heaven ! |
| Sumens illud ave | Thou receiving that salutation |

* *Barthol. de los Rios.* † *Hours of the Blessed Mary ; and see also the Rosary.*

Gabrielis ore,
 Funda nos in pace,
 Mutans Evæ nomen ;
 Solve vincla reis,
 Profer lumen cæcis,
 Mala nostra pelle,
 Bona cuncta posce,
MONSTRA TE ESSE MATREM.
 Sumat *per te* preces,
 Qui pro nobis natus,
 Tulit esse tuus ;
 Virgo singularis,
 Inter omnes mitis
 Nos culpis solutos,
 Mites fac et castos,
 Vitam præsta puram,
 Iter para tutum,
 Ut videntes Jesum,
 Semper collectemur.
 Sit laus Deo Patri,
 Summo Christo decus,
 Spiritui Sancto,
 Tribus honor unus.

AMEN."

From the mouth of Gabriel,
 Place us in peace,
 Changing the name of Eve ;
 Loose the chains of the guilty,
 Bring forth light to the blind,
 Drive away our evils,
 Demand for us every good,
SHew THYSELF A MOTHER.
 Let him receive our prayers *through thee*,
 Who was born for us,
 And endured to be thy son.
 O eminent Virgin,
 Gentle among all
 Us freed from guilt,
 Make gentle and chaste,
 Give us a pure life,
 Prepare a safe journey,
 That we, seeing Jesus,
 May always be rejoiced.
 Let praise be to God the Father,
 And glory to Christ on high,
 And to the Holy Spirit.
 To Three one honour.

AMEN.

SERMON XVII.

I PETER III. 15, 16.

“Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear, having a good conscience ; that whereas they speak evil of you as of evil-doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.”

THE task which we originally proposed is now completed. All the main distinctions, both in doctrine and practice, between our own Church and that of Rome, have been considered in their order. Each one severally has been set out before you as it has arisen, either in the ground-work of our faith, or in the doctrines of the sacraments, or in the objects and principles of divine worship. It remains for me now, by way of conclusion, to sum up in one review all that has been said, so that the whole, by the blessing of the Holy Spirit, may leave upon our minds its suitable impression. While the picture has been hitherto examined in detail, so as to cause us much wonder and regret in the manifold corruptions of Rome, let the whole mass, taken together in the aggregate, reflect back

upon our minds the consolations of our own true and firm position, and so tend to “strengthen, settle, stablish us,” in our own pure faith, “as it is in Jesus.”

Let us review what has been done. The object has been to analyze and determine what were not, and what were, those distinctive points which had separated the Church of Rome from the Church Catholic. The general plan and principle upon which I have endeavoured to conduct and fulfil this object, has been to take those common fundamental principles upon which the universal Church of Christ is built, and in which, therefore, as of necessity, the Churches of Rome and England agree; and then to show that the distinctive error of Romanism, in all cases, has been that of ADDITION. The value of this principle as a means of rightly detecting the truth, will be evident to you on a little consideration. Had Rome differed from the Church Catholic in any direct opposition, in any matters *fundamentally* distinct,—such, for instance, as those by which we can separate a Mohamedan or a Hindoo from a Christian,—then the distinction between us would have been so palpable, that it would never have been possible for any suspicion to arise as to the probability of the one declining into the other. But when the two creeds, as ours do, proceed together up to a certain point, and while the one remains stedfast in truth, the other falls into error, merely by adding to

and overloading that which they hold in common, then it ceases to be a matter of surprise that there should be a difficulty, after the lapse of many ages, in detecting the precise points where the truth is lost, and the error begins. The closer and more alike two objects are the one to the other, and the more points they hold in common, the more knowledge, caution, and experience, does it require to detect those points which are *not* in common. The broader the basis of the agreeing points, the more sagacity does it require to separate the *distinctive* points, so as not to disturb or confound the line of separation between them.

And this I take to be the great primary cause of the outcry about Popery, which has so much disturbed us ; and it was upon this principle that I therefore have endeavoured throughout, first to show you the common principles of our agreement, as each several subject came before our notice, and then the points of Romish addition, so that we might at the same time see how true and faithful our own Church has been in her restoration to the first principles of Christianity, and how highly and strongly she embraces the first faith of the holy Scriptures, and the early fathers ; and therefore, by means of the common agreement clearly defined, the more accurately perceive what were the real errors of Rome, which we in common with other Catholics repudiate and abhor. Just as in some noble temple ; the foundation

may have been well laid by a wise and skilful master-builder, the lines may have been marked out for the shape and proportions of the building with wisdom and harmonious analogy, but as time advanced, some presumptuous man, not entering into the mind of him who originally designed it, may have taken upon himself to add either to its height, or length, or breadth, so that the whole beauty of the building in its first proportions has been mutilated and destroyed. And yet withal so gradual have been these additions, that although to the critical and experienced eye of him that is well skilled in architecture the exact mark of them may be detected, and he can say, so far has the original design been observed, but here the corruptions begin;—still to the multitude these niceties of criticism are lost, and they merge their condemnation of that which is notoriously corrupt, in one sweeping censure of the universal fabric, forgetting, or not knowing, that they ought to distinguish between the foundation designed by the architect, and the superstructure added by the innovator. Even so, in the spiritual building of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the multitude the niceties of distinction are unperceived; and while they behold something in the aggregate, which to their knowledge and their faith is manifestly corrupt, they wait not, and they care not to distinguish one part of the building from the other, but in one general condemnation

all that is true, and all that is false, is swept away together. To separate the *addition* from the original they care not ; *all* must be wrong because the *addition* is wrong.

This, then, was the reason why I have conducted all my observations on this plan, carefully endeavouring to teach those who might not have been aware of their deficiency, a little more accuracy both in their knowledge and in their manner of speaking of those high and holy things which belong to their religion, humbly striving to exact of them an acknowledgment, that because things are *similar*, they are not therefore the *same*. Let us now proceed to review some of the particulars mentioned.

You will directly perceive how it was that you were led (or those who made the outcry were led), to pronounce a hasty judgment about Popery, by reason of certain *similarities* between the two Churches ; those similarities of necessity existing, but not being known to you, until brought out by a more close following of the principles of our Church. Certain points have slumbered, or have been so kept in abeyance, that they have been altogether lost sight of. The principal points of the creed have been for a long time preached with faithfulness, as far as they went themselves, but only with this unfairness, that one of them has been entirely omitted—that of “THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.” It has been lately restored to

its just position, and in the restoration many remarkable points of doctrine and practice have followed ; but in these remarkable points have principally lain the errors of Rome. While therefore the other articles of the creed, in which there was no distinctive error, were the principal points observed upon in the teaching of the clergy, such as the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, Crucifixion, and the Atonement, Rome was kept out of view, and Rome in consequence made onwards its silent way in the affections of thoughtful men, who found our own Church practically forgetting one of its own fundamental articles of faith. So it came to pass that when the clergy, or certain of the clergy, perceiving this, brought forward more prominently the forgotten article,—along with the forgotten article came back the forgotten similarity,—with the similarity came back the ancient hatred and suspicion,—and this, aided by the injudicious excesses of some, paved very naturally the way for the alarms of the ignorant, and the suspicions of the timid.

Let us pursue this idea in detail. You will quickly see how the prevailing source of our alarms has been, the assumption of a similarity as proof of identity.

I. In the first place, with this view, I considered *tradition*. There were several doctrines and practices, I endeavoured to show, not positively and in exact words set down in Scripture ;—such as

the Holy Trinity, infant baptism, the observance of the Lord's Day, and the like. The teaching of these, as found in the Church, was asserted to depend upon tradition in the first instance, but proved to be true subsequently, as collected out of Scripture.* Any person viewing tradition in this light might have asserted it to be a useful thing in Christianity, and thereupon those who might not be well instructed in the doctrines of the Church, and not careful in measuring their ideas by their words, upon the mere hearing of the *sound* tradition, might have immediately cried out, this is *popery*. They have frequently heard it said, that tradition is one of the principal causes of the errors of the Romish Church; but because it is so in the Romish Church, it does not follow that it is in ours. A little more closeness of observation, and a little more patience, would have shown those persons, on our principle of addition, that while the universal Church holds the doctrine that apostolical tradition is a useful help and comment in Christianity, yet it is only so when in *unison with and proved by Scripture*; while the Church of Rome holds, that tradition may convey doctrines essential to salvation, *independently of, nay superior to Scripture*. It does not surely follow, that because our use of tradition is *like* the Romish use of tradition, that therefore it is the same.

* Let the reader first refer to Sermon IV; and afterwards to the APPENDIX at the end of the volume.

II. Secondly, we have spoken of the *Church*. Of its power,—of its divine origin,—of its independence of the state ;—of its authority to regulate holy rites and ceremonies, and to appoint forms of prayer and liturgies,—and its necessity by apostolical succession to ordain clergy ;—of the necessity also of all its members, lay or clerical, to submit with patient obedience to its decrees. But men have been frequently reading about the “*tyranny of the Church of Rome*,” how Rome has assumed to herself a power above the state, coercing the state, and ruling kings as well as subjects with a strange and unaccountable despotism. And because any claim of power and authority for the Church seems *like* the assumptions of Rome, therefore it *is* the assumptions of Rome, men forgetting that we ever acknowledge the sovereign of these realms as our earthly head ; and that because we claim a *spiritual* freedom and a *spiritual* jurisdiction, it does not follow that we speak a single syllable of anything *temporal*.

III. Thirdly, in the doctrines of *confession* and *absolution*. The desire of our Church has been pointed out, that men should, when they themselves *desire* it, have the privilege of confessing their sins, according to the Scripture, to their priests, and that the priest has the power committed to him of “*the keys*,” of “binding and loosing.” Now because this sounds *like* the doctrines of Rome—and all the world knows how

fearful and dreadful those doctrines are on these points,—therefore this *is* the doctrine of Rome ; men forgetting the wide and essential distinction between the two ;—that while we, according to the Scripture, only *invite* men, and for their own comfort, to confess their sins, Rome makes it *compulsory* ; and that when we assert the doctrine of the keys as *declaratory*, conveying by our ministerial authority, the grace of God's pardon, they make it the *priest's* pardon, and pronounce it judicially. Men lose sight of the fundamental principle conveyed in the Scriptures, which belongs to both ; and because Rome has made gross additions, therefore the fundamental principle, along with the additions, must be cast aside.

IV. Fourthly, in the doctrine and practice of *fasting*. Because it is well known that the Church of Rome pursues this practise upon an unjustifiable principle, appointing it as a meritorious work, and commanding it through her priesthood as a special atonement for a special sin, and it has so happened that fasting has also been more prominently taught of late in our own Church ; therefore the fasting appointed by the Church of England, is the same thing as the fasting of the Church of Rome. But it has been forgotten, that in our Prayer Book, and in our canons, and particularly in our homilies, there are many special directions as to this holy duty ; our Prayer Book mentioning many special days

throughout the year, and the Scripture most assuredly pointing it out as a Christian duty, "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites." Now because it was abused by the one Church, it would not follow that its *use* should entirely be set aside by the other.

V. In the doctrine of the *Sacraments* and the sacramental ordinances. Because we insist strongly and continually on their observance, as means of grace, on their frequency, on their necessity to our spiritual welfare, on the high character, particularly, of Baptism as a channel of regeneration, and the holy Supper of the Lord as a channel of a continually renewed spiritual union with Christ and his members;—because all this is something like depending on things external, and attributing to the Church a power in conveying by outward and ceremonial channels the grace of God; therefore it is Romish. Or again:

VI. In the doctrine of an intermediate state. Because we see clearly that between our death and the day of Judgment, there must be some state of existence in which the souls of those that die in the Lord, remain; therefore that doctrine, being something *like* it, must of necessity be *purgatory*. Or again:

VII. In the doctrine of the holy eucharist. Because we would hold the high *sacrificial* character of that feast, making it not only a commemorative sign and token of Christian love, but an offering on our part to the living God, after the manner

of a sacrifice ; therefore it is the *sacrifice of the mass*. And because we would hold, that in the consecrated bread and wine, there is the “*real presence of Christ*,” and that his “*body and blood* are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper,” therefore we hold *transubstantiation* ; men losing sight altogether of the leading and simple fact of a *spiritual* real presence being distinct from a *corporeal* real presence ; and a spiritual offering of our souls and bodies, our alms and our prayers being distinct from the bodily sacrificing over and over again of the flesh of our Lord ; the one being the doctrine of all Christians from time out of mind, the other a specific and unauthorized addition of Rome.

VIII. And still once more, in the doctrine of the saints and holy angels. Because, according to our Prayer Book, we would urge upon our people a due observance of those days set apart by our Church for that special purpose ; because we profess according to our creed, “*a communion of saints* ;” because we lift up our hearts and minds in our liturgy, and bless God for all those departed in his faith and fear ; therefore, there being something in popery about the *worship* of saints and angels, because they also keep days and festivals to commemorate them, these two things are set down as the same ; and to keep a saint’s holy day, or to praise God for the dead, is a popish practice. There is indeed a ground of

similitude,—there is a common ground,—but who cannot see, upon a little reflection, that because we *commemorate* saints and angels, it does not follow that we should *worship* them; and because we bless God for those departed in His faith, it does not follow that *we* either pray for *them*, or ask *them* to pray for *us*.

No, my brethren: in all these doctrines, I hope I have fully and conclusively shown you how fearfully the errors of Rome have prevailed over the true religion of Christ, and how truly primitive and scriptural is all that we hold and do in the Church of England; while Rome, upon the ground common to us both, has built up a creed and a practice in every way injurious to the faith of her people, and derogatory to the honour of our God. No man could pass, on any of these points, from the tenets of the one Church to the tenets of the other, and pronounce them the same, but from want of knowledge; no one could possibly impute the errors of Rome to the teaching of the clergy of England, if he were aware, either on the one part, of the real principles maintained in our creeds and liturgies, or on the other part, of the strange abuses and extravagances of Rome. It is haste, want of consideration, want of thought, want of learning, that has created the alarms of the present day. Honest examination is all that is needed to set such matters on their right footing. This examination we have given. May God of his infinite mercy bless the issue.

I now pass on to another leading feature by which Rome is distinguished from ourselves. It is one not so particularly mentioned in the preceding pages ; therefore a few words here may not be out of place. It is in regard to *forms* and *ceremonial observances* in divine worship. Here, also, a confusion has been made and an outcry of alarm raised, from a similar want of perception, that the acknowledgment of a principle does not involve the acknowledgment of all the extremes to which that principle may by injudicious or perverse persons be extended. There are few sects of Christians who utterly discard forms and ceremonial observances in their mode of worship. Many *profess* to do so ; many profess to abhor the book of Common Prayer, because it is a *form*, but they forget that the saying over and over again the same extemporaneous prayer becomes a *form* after a time ; and the mere getting up into a pulpit to preach is in reality a *ceremony*. Therefore even by these sects, though they do not themselves perceive it, ceremonial observances are acknowledged as a principle in religion. All spiritual blessings, by the analogy of God's dealing with man, must be expected to proceed through external channels. The Almighty *might* work his spiritual blessings without any form at all, as He might have created man without any body at all. The soul of man is spirit. It might have pleased God to create this spirit, and

to deal with this spirit without any intervening channel. But it did not so please Him. He clothed this spirit in a material frame-work--the body; and through that material frame-work, it pleased Him that the soul of man should grow from year to year in knowledge and grace, until at length the one should fall away, and the other, purified and exalted, should ascend into its place, clothed with a spiritual body, raised from earth to heaven. Now this material frame-work, the body, is an *outward form*, while the soul is the *inward spirit*. It is for the soul that the body is made; and so it comes to pass, that as we could not have the body (as we are at present constituted) without the spirit, so neither could we have the spirit without the body. Now this simple fact is an exact representation of the necessity of outward forms and observances in religion. Whatever the soul may think or feel, however it may believe or obey, however it may be filled with the most ardent love, or be lifted up with the acutest spiritual emotions, still it will be perceived that all these high things must have entered into the spirit by the channel of the body. For take away the body, and there would never have been any spirit in existence. It is through the senses, and through the imagination which is affected by the senses, that the spirit of man within is moved to the high things of religious devotion. If we were angelic beings, without bodies, we might

then pray or worship in all places alike. The crowd of the streets, the noise of the marketplace, the confusion of the tavern, the worldly excitement of the exchange, all would be equally suitable, and just as appropriate as a church, as places where men might congregate for divine worship; and they could all as simultaneously betake themselves to the spiritual emotions of religion in the one place as in the other. But how is it they do not?—how is it they seek a *church* for prayer and public worship, notwithstanding they have all these public places of resort appropriated to other purposes?—that they all leave such places empty, and find another public place, when publicly they seek to worship God? Because of the principle, that they are creatures dependent upon FORMS,—because *outward things* acting through the medium of their senses, ARE necessary to excite within them a right frame of mind for the things of God; because they know and feel that it is very difficult indeed to conquer the body, and temper the body, so as to make it altogether to forget externals, or without externals to bend to the impulses of faith, and prayer, and that religious meditation which God requires at the hands of those who worship Him.

Hence, therefore, we do but carry into full operation the evident intention of the Almighty in the manner of his dealing with us, when we build *churches*; and having built churches, pre-

pare public forms of prayer to be used therein, and accompany those forms of prayer with certain ceremonial observances and directions, for conformity's sake, and decency, and order in the promotion of true devotional feeling. Hence it follows, that all that can be done effectually to promote this spirit of uniformity, and decency, and order, ought to be done by every Church in her own sphere, and according to the temper of her people, and the circumstances of her times; and hence it again follows, that every country which belongs to a Church so regulating and appointing divine ceremonies, ought to find within her people an obedient and a submissive spirit.

Now this, my brethren, is one of the points at issue in the religious alarm. All men, we know, have a certain general knowledge, an intuitive feeling about the show, and glitter, and pomp, of the Romanist rites of public worship. The magnificence of her churches,—the costliness of her processions,—the dress of her priesthood,—the burning of incense,—the bowings to the altar,—the kneelings and prostrations,—the adoration of the host,—the chanting of the prayers to solemn music,—all this has fixed itself upon most persons as a sort of acknowledged sign of Popery, and therefore in so many minds it seems to follow, that *all* ceremonies, and signs, and religious gestures, and religious singing, and carefulness in outward things, is a sign of Popery; men forgetting

to distinguish what is useful from what is injurious, what has meaning from what is unintelligible, what is according to primitive usage from what is a mere modern interpolation ; forgetting that the error is by no means contained in the *principle* of an attention to outward things (for they themselves, and all men allow the principle), but solely in the extent and degree to which it is carried.

Now let us observe what was the conduct of those religious sects who were the most violent opposers of our Church at the time shortly subsequent to the Reformation ; I mean the Puritans, Independents, Anabaptists, and the like, who succeeded in the reign of Charles I in overthrowing the Church, and establishing for a time their own sectarian rule in her place. What was the spirit of their opposition ? It was directed mainly against our use of external ceremonies, on the ground that they were remains of, or bore a similarity to Romanism. They did not find fault with the doctrines of the Church so much as her practices. They objected to our use of the surplice, to our sign of the cross in baptism, to our giving the names of saints to our churches, to the great ornaments and sumptuous character of our cathedrals which we desired to retain, to our mixture of prayer with reading of Scripture, to our setting more value on the prayers of devout worshippers in a set form, than on sermons and other spiritual excitements of the people ; to the variety of our

gestures in prayer, sometimes standing, sometimes sitting, sometimes kneeling; to our chanting the Psalms of David to music, to our use of saints' days, and holy days, and fasting days; and altogether, in fact, to our making divine worship an uniform and regular service, always alike, and always (*as they said*), cold and formal, instead of spiritual, internal, and stimulating to the feelings and the affections. But to sum up all in one. The whole spirit of the opposition might be centred in this,—“*It was too like Rome.*” But the wise and learned Hooker, in answering these and a thousand similar objections, makes this remark:—

“Touching our conformity with the Church of Rome, as also of the difference between some reformed Churches and ours, that which generally hath been already answered may serve for answer to that exception, which in these two respects they take particularly against the form of our Common Prayer. To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome, were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in that they are wise men, and Christian men; some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, and others whom we much

more affect leave it for newer, and change it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble those whom we love.”*

* Eccles. Polity, book v. § xxviii. In the reign of Edward the Sixth, one of our bishops—*Hooper*—was a strenuous opposer of the ecclesiastical vestments used in our Church, on the ground of their similarity to Rome. In a letter to Bishop Hooper, Peter Martyr remarks, that “to maintain the unlawfulness of all rites and customs practised in the Church of Rome, looks like an indefensible assertion; that to govern by such narrow maxims would draw a very inconvenient restraint upon the Church of God..... that granting these distinctions were the inventions of the see of Rome, he did not think the contagion of Popery so malignant as to carry infection to every thing it touched, and make it prove mortal to a good man that made use of it”.....and in times still subsequent—the reign of James the First, at the Hampton Court Conference—similar objections were brought against us, and a similar defence set up. The use of the cross was objected to on the score of its being like idolatry; and Dr. Reynolds brought forward the instance of the brazen serpent beaten to powder by Hezekiah, because it had been abused to idolatry. But king James replied, that “the objection they rested upon made against themselves, for the *superstitious abuse* of it by Popery is an argument that it was *commendably* used in ages prior to Popery.” “I have lived,” says the king, “among these men ever since I was ten years old, and nothing has given me a stronger aversion to their system, than their peremptory disapproving of everything used by the Papists. This way of reasoning I detest. For my part, I know no way of avoiding the charge of novelty objected by the Papists, but by answering that we retain the primitive use of things, and only stand off from the innovations brought in by themselves; but Dr. Reynolds’ argument would bring us to renounce the Trinity, and many

Now might not this remark apply very much to our present day? What are the objections which we constantly hear about the increased attention to the forms of our beloved Church? If indeed those forms were for one shadow of an instant to supersede the spirit,—if any man could be sunk into an absurdity so great, or deceive himself by an hypocrisy so foul, as to imagine that his prayer-book was his religion, or his daily attendance at prayer his religion, or his weekly attendance at communion, or his scrupulous regularity in following the rubrical directions,* or the canons

other fundamental points of belief, because they are common to us and the Papists. Dr. Reynolds," said the king, with an air of pleasantry, "they used to wear shoes and stockings in times of Popery; have you, therefore, a mind to go barefoot?"

Such has been the objection to our Church's principles, all along her history. See Collier, part i. book iv. 294; part ii. book viii. 293.

* A strict following of the Rubric in the public services of our Church, has been one of the objections made, and one cause of the present outcry about Popery, evidently arising from the same spirit—a jealousy against minute attention to external things; but let the laity remember the solemn obligations by which the clergy are bound to adhere faithfully to the rubric of their prayer book, as at ordination undertaken. The rubric was meant as a barrier and safeguard against Popery. It was specially obligatory on the clergy, for the sake of keeping them within certain bounds in ceremonial things; and surely if it was so devised, there can be no danger of the evil against which we are thereby guarded, provided we observe it faithfully, and keep WITHIN IT. But if we keep within it, as against Popery,—so must we act *up to it*, as against Dissent.

Archdeacon Sharp says, in his charges to the clergy: "The

of his Church as to days of festivals or fasts, or his punctual observance of the right postures of his body, standing or kneeling, or bowing at the name of Jesus,—if all, or any of such like cere-

Rubric being the standard of uniformity of worship in our communion, the adding to which tends towards opening a gap to Popish superstitions and the increase of human inventions in the service of God ; and the subtracting from which tends towards paving a way to a fanatical disuse and contempt of rites and ceremonies,—therefore we are obliged not only to declare our *ex animo* approbation, assent and consent to the matter of the rubric, but are laid under *religious promises* that we will in every particular prescribed in and by it conform ourselves to it, as the rule of our ministration.”

And again he says, even more strongly :

“ We have by our subscriptions at both ordinations, by one of our vows at the altar for the order of priesthood, by our subscriptions and declarations of conformity before our ordinary, and repetition of them in the Church before our congregations, and likewise by our declarations of assent and consent, as prescribed in the Act of Uniformity,—I say we have in all these several ways tied ourselves down to a regular, constant, conscientious performance of all and every thing prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, according to the usage of the Church of England.....How frivolous it is then for any of us to say that the connivance or the presumed consent of our ordinary, or the private conveniency of ourselves and families, or the obliging any of our parishioners, or the apparent inexpediency of adhering to the letter in some few cases, will dissolve this our obligation to conformity.”—*Archdeacon Sharp on the Rubric*, Discourse I. pp. 5 and 12.

It would be well, therefore, for the laity, before they object to the clergy in their attempts to revive a faithful following of the Rubric, to consider the tenure of those holy orders under which every ordained priest is pledged to follow it.

monial things, were to stand in his estimation as substitutes for that "holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," or that "faith, without which it is impossible to please God," then indeed we should be a miserable people. We the priests of God should deserve the just indignation of our Lord;—"Woe unto you, blind guides, straining at gnats and swallowing camels;" and those whom we taught would soon end in a race of human beings, than whom God looks upon none with greater aversion; "Whited sepulchres fair to look upon without, but inwardly full of dead men's bones, and all corruption." But this objection to a strict attention to outward ceremonies goes upon a mere presumption. We urge a strict attention to the rubrics of our Prayer-book;—that we should perform our divine service in exact conformity with the rules given us by the Church;—that all we do in our Church Service should have a spiritual meaning,—that psalms should be sung or chanted *because they are psalms*, and that prayers should be prayed on our knees *because they are prayers*, and that doxologies should be sung or said standing up *because they are doxologies*. Now since it happens accidentally that these things are like the Romanists' way of performing divine service, is it therefore Romanism? Only consider, I will not say the folly, but the unfairness of such an argument; only consider the unfairness of pronouncing of a thing by a fancied similitude prejudged, and

from observing the similitude, asserting the identity. It only requires a very slight recollection, a slight calling of the mind away from old prejudices and mere habits of being guided by the fashion of a day, for every one to confess, that the rectitude or non-rectitude of a thing is to be judged, not by those who have either used it or followed it, but its own intrinsic merits;—its essence, not its accidents;—its use, not its abuse;—its principle, not its corruptions.

And now I cannot do better than by way of general conclusion, refer to that text which I have placed at the head of this lecture. It is singularly applicable to the circumstances under which we at present stand, both in regard to the laity and also the clergy.

“Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear, having a good conscience; that whereas they speak evil of you as of evil-doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.”

There are two parties here, some that speak evil, and some that are spoken evil of: those that are spoken evil of, are represented as having a “good conscience,” and as “having a good conversation in Christ,” that is, rightly intending and rightly acting, as far as human infirmity will allow them; while those that speak the evil are represented as “*ashamed*,” and the shame is represented as arising in their minds, by reason of

having made a false accusation—" *that they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.*" But how is this shame to be created in the evil-speakers? how is a sense of the injustice of what they have accused against others to be brought home to them? By those that are evil-spoken of "being ready to give an answer to every man that asketh them of the hope that is in them." But still, again, *how* are they to be ready to give this answer? By possessing adequate knowledge and information upon all those points which are the subjects of the evil-speaking. In a great many instances men speak evil one of another, not from any malicious motives, but from *ignorance*. They do not know, in the first instance, that it *is* evil which they speak: they do not perceive, in the second instance, that the subjects of which they are disputing are beyond their knowledge, or out of the reach of their attainments; for it is always a part of ignorance not to know its ignorance. Therefore it comes to pass that many things are said in the world of very serious import, and many grave subjects are handled in a light and jesting strain, those who handle them being unaware that their tendency is of most vital consequence, and that they being blind, are profaning the deep things of God. But in progress of time some light breaks in upon them. More study is bestowed upon the controverted points; a more accurate knowledge is acquired of those subjects

which they have before spoken of carelessly, and then of a sudden they become "*ashamed*." But until this knowledge comes, they go on scattering their mischief on all sides, not maliciously intending it as mischief, but misled by the vanity of their own minds, a vanity which always leads those who know but little to speak more confidently than those who know much.

There are two points, then, to which we shall do well to give heed, and two duties for our consideration. The one affects the evil-speakers, the other those against whom the evil has been unconsciously spoken. The duty of the one is to gain knowledge, of the other to impart knowledge,—the duty of the one is to obtain sufficient data upon which to pronounce judgment, before judgment is pronounced; and before they join in the outcry of the multitude, to ascertain more closely what that outcry is about; before they speak evil of men as evil-doers, to ascertain that they *are* evil-doers, lest when they have been indulging in their careless way of speaking, farther information being vouchsafed to them, they become, like those in the text, "*ashamed*." But the duty of the other is, "to be ready to give to every man that asketh, a reason of the hope that is in them;" to endeavour, not in any anger or indignation, still less with any maliciousness of triumph, or any confidence of self-presumption, but as the apostle directs, in "*meekness and fear*," to explain the

points so misunderstood, and to impart to those who require it a clearer insight into the deep things of God ; where they have been mistaken, to set them right ; and where they have been careless and inaccurate, to furnish them with more precision of thought, and greater exactness of information.

This latter duty, my brethren, has been mine in the lectures which have now occupied us so long. The “ Answer for the hope that is in us,” I have endeavoured by this means to furnish ; and I have striven to do so according to the apostle’s precept, with “ *meekness and fear* ;” with *meekness*, because I would not offend any ; with *fear*, because in approaching the sacred mysteries of our religion (which in so many instances I have been obliged to do), it is always an anxious thing, lest we forget in the heat of controversy the holy ground on which we walk.

You, my brethren, along with me (at least *some*), may have been classed among those of a party name, as tending in your religious views towards the corruptions of Rome ; and because you are assiduous in your public prayers, and frequent in your communions ; because you have learned to form a high notion of the ministerial character as of apostolic succession, to reverence sacraments, and to observe holy days ; because you have learned to hold faithfully the higher doctrines of your Church, till of late hidden and

obscured ; or because you have a true fear and regret in considering the errors and the evils of schism and heresy ; or because you love order, discipline, and regularity, in your church service, rather than accidental emotions, and turbulent and sudden heats of excitement ; because, in short, you would rather trust to the moderation and the wisdom of the *judgment of the Church*, than to your own *private judgment* and self-will, in the things of your religion,—you,—I say—because of these things, may have been, with me and many others, designated by those absurd party names, which have of late so much disturbed the Church ; and therefore, in your behalf as well as in my own, I have given forth this “ *answer to them that have asked us a reason of the hope that is in us.*” I have pointed out to you all the high doctrines of our Church as Scriptural and true, and all the devotional customs of our Church, as right and reasonable ; and being Scriptural and true, right and reasonable, I have shown you that they are as remote from Rome and popery, as they are from sectarianism and dissent. I have striven to point out, through many subjects of controversy (always bearing in mind the apostle’s condition, “ meekness and fear”) how very high our beloved Church rears her head,—how very beautifully she stands among the children of men,—how faithfully her injunctions to all the high things of God are

sounded forth in her Creeds, her Liturgies, and her Articles ;—and yet withal as clearly defined in all her outlines, and as distinct from the erroneous tenets of Rome, as the white cliffs of her own shore are distinct from the ocean waters which surround her.

O that we could gain for her such an obedience to her authority, and love for her discipline, as for her purity and for her antiquity she surely merits ! But we must wait. In our patience we must possess our souls. Let us not however despair. Notwithstanding our present tribulation, we may yet see the time when once again, in all her full efficiency and strength, “like a giant refreshed with wine,” she may rise up, and “put to flight the armies of the aliens ;”—when she may possess once more both a priesthood and a people, such as becometh the servants of God,—a PRIESTHOOD ready as of old to sacrifice their labour, their learning, and their lives, for her welfare,—and, in her welfare, the glory of our Lord, and the salvation of souls ;—“not given to filthy lucre,” not “dumb dogs that cannot bark,” but “apt to teach,” temperate, wise, holy. And A PEOPLE ready to obey, and willing to follow, in all gentleness of spirit and righteousness of life ;—not gainsaying, not disputing, not self-willed, not heady or high-minded, not “lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God,” but gradually returning under the blessings and the

privileges which she furnishes (by the grace of God and the Lord Jesus Christ), gradually returning, as becometh such a mother, to the *obedience of sons*.

“Happy is the people who are in such a case ; yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord.”

THE END.

APPENDIX,

Referring to Sermons III and IV, on the Subject of Tradition.

SOME exceptions have been taken to the doctrines maintained in the third and fourth sermons—on the subject of *tradition*. It may be as well, therefore, to review certain expressions in these sermons so as to obviate any possible misunderstanding, and to clear away any doubts which might have arisen in the minds of casual readers.

1. In the first place, at page 77, it is asserted thus :—

“ We do not say that there might have been, we say that there *were* many things—many things of instruction, many things of custom, many things of discipline, which were not written. How can we deny it, when St. John positively says so? No doubt there were such things,—but, allowing this most fully, we do not see why these things should be “ necessary to salvation.”

In this passage, it is not meant that St. John directly and in so many words, says, that things of instruction were omitted in the Scripture,—but only this, that, as we know that all Christ's sayings were instructive, in so far as any of his *sayings* were omitted, so would his *instructions* be omitted. There might have been many instructive sayings, conveying advice, and throwing light upon things obscure, and yet withal not amounting to a doctrine essential to salvation. Now let us examine. St.

John says (xx. 30), "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book;" and again (xxi. 25), "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." On referring to these passages, we shall find that the "*signs*" mentioned in the one, and the "*things*" mentioned in the other, refer to *conversations* on very important subjects; the former with St. Thomas on the subject of the resurrection. Now, looking to the word "*other*," as coupled here with "*signs*," it must be inferred that the apostle alludes to something similar. If, therefore, the doctrine of the resurrection is a matter of instruction,—the "*other signs*" which the apostle mentions, would also refer to matters of instruction. We are aware that there was nothing in our Lord's life, either word or action, but was in every sense an *instruction*. His miracles, parables, conversations,—every thing or word was of consequence in the imparting of his Gospel to his first disciples, and his *example* is continually set forth in the Epistles on this ground. One saying of his, we do know, as recorded in the Acts, not mentioned in the Gospels—a *matter of instruction*—(Acts xx. 35)—"Remember the words of the Lord Jesus. How he said, "*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*" It is quite possible, nay, it is certain, that there must have been many other such sayings, involving matters of *instruction*, matters of *discipline*, and matters of *custom*, but which were either not so important as to be imperative on all mankind as necessary to salvation, or which, if necessary to salvation, had been recorded and proved in other ways by the Evangelists, and therefore needed not to be repeated.

This is all the passage was meant to convey.

II. At page 79, there is another passage to which exception has been made, from a want of clearness (probably) in the expressions used.

“The first great point in which the use of tradition must be evident to all, is this,—*that the Scriptures ARE the Scriptures.* There are evidently no Scriptures to prove this, and Scripture cannot prove itself.”

It is not meant here that we are not able to illustrate and expound Scripture by Scripture, or that Scripture is not an interpreter of Scripture, and so cannot prove its own doctrines. Every one knows well that the great beauty of the Holy Bible as given us in our authorized translation, is that constant marginal reference by which Scripture is shown to illustrate and throw light upon itself by comparing one passage with another. No one, I should have hoped, would imagine that the writer meant in the above passage to deny so self-evident a truth. The words, “*Scripture cannot prove itself,*” must be looked at for their meaning, in the context. In what sense, or with reference to what, is it so said? What is the context speaking of? The *canonicity* of Scripture—“that Scripture *is* the Scripture.” The canonicity of Scripture must be shown by something external and from without. That Scripture is canonical Scripture, or not canonical, in the first instance depends upon testimony. Why are St. Paul’s Epistles received as canonical, and St. Banabas’ Epistle and St. Clement’s rejected? The very word canonical means a rule of admission. Who made the rule of admission? The Church. The rule depended on the universal consent of the different Churches—that is to say, tradition. Once establish Scripture to be canonical, and then doctrines are proved out of it, but no doctrines can be proved until first it is admitted into the canon. As to the texts which seem to speak to the contrary, such as John v. 39, and

2 Tim. iii. 15, a little consideration will show that they refer merely to *the Old Testament Scriptures*. They are texts which have reference to the Scriptures already admitted into the canon of Holy Writ by *the Jews*. They cannot refer to the Christian Scriptures. As, for instance, in the case of Timothy ; when Timothy was a child there were no Christian Scriptures at all, but he had been taught, St. Paul says, to apply the Jewish Scriptures in the right way, “through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

III. At page 80, I find another passage to which exception has been made. It regards the Holy Trinity. It is there said :

“Is it possible, my brethren, do you think, that you, or I, or any one, be he ever so gifted with the powers of man, could have deduced and invented [found out], for himself this most wonderful and mysterious doctrine out of the Bible. There is no mention of the Trinity in Unity to be found in Scripture in so many direct words.”

It is not meant herein that we could not find the bare notion of a three-fold God—the mere bare assertion of Triune Deity. But this bare notion of a Triune Deity is by no means the WHOLE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY as taught under anathema by the Church Catholic. If any one were asked,—What is the doctrine of the Trinity? he would refer to the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, and he would explain it in reference, not only to the fact of a three-fold God, but also to,—

1. The equality of the three persons.
2. The consubstantiality of the three persons.
3. The coeternity of the three persons.
4. The Son, *though a Son*, begotten *from everlasting* of the Father.
5. The Son being God, begotten of the Father from

everlasting, and yet man, born of the Virgin, perfect God, and perfect man.

6. The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son together, yet equal in eternity and equal in substance with both, though *proceeding*.

Now this is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as taught in our Church under anathema, and pronounced to be necessary to salvation ; and it is of this doctrine, this *whole and general doctrine* as of necessity required to make an article of faith, that it is asserted in the sermon, that it is beyond the reach of any private individual, if unassisted by external teaching and guidance, to find in the Scripture of his own private judgment. It is very remarkable, that whenever persons of their own private judgment *have* tried to separate themselves from the teaching of the Church, and to stand aloof on this question, from the traditions handed down to them ; they have fallen into heresy, as is the case of Eutyches, Macedonius, Nestorius, Arius, and the like. It surely cannot be incorrect, it certainly is humble, to reflect that we all come to the investigation of this truth in Scripture with minds already trained. It is difficult, nay, impossible, to replace ourselves in such a condition as to come to the searching of the Scriptures with unprepared minds, seeing that we are taught this doctrine and all other doctrines by a practical tradition in our catechisms as children. It may safely, I hope, be repeated, as in the sermon, only with the understanding of what is *meant* by the Holy Trinity as now explained ; that we are first *led to it*, according to Bishop Pearson, by the creed, and prove it afterwards, by Scripture. Let it be remembered, also, that the assertion is made in exactly the same sense as it is made by Hooker, quoted in the sermon at page 87. What does Hooker

there say? "Our belief, in *the Trinity*, the coeternity of the Son of God with his Father, the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, these, with such other principal points, the necessity whereof is by none denied, are, notwithstanding, in Scripture no where to be found by express literal mention, only deduced they are out of Scripture, by COLLECTION."

We must immediately pursue this by asking, who is to make the collection? If the answer be, any private individual, each one for himself, then what becomes of our Article, that "*the Church has authority in controversies of faith.*" If the answer be, *the Church*, then we come round again to the previous point; for the *Church* is exactly what is signified by tradition. It is the Church that has handed down this doctrine, and having now COLLECTED it out of Scripture, imposes it as an article of faith necessary to salvation.

However, independent of all this, let it also be remembered, that it is quite unfair to select one single passage in any writing, and pronounce an opinion upon it apart from the context; the whole general drift is to be taken into consideration, and the whole spirit of the writer's intention. And this may fairly be appealed to in the general course of Sermon III and IV, as bearing on the doctrine of our sixth Article, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

Such are the main points of objection which have been made to the views set forward in Sermons III and IV. I shall only now add, in order to show that these views are in entire consonance with some of our best and most learned divines, the opinions of some few who have expressed themselves on the subject, and with this let the matter terminate. The following great names will be sufficient authority to convince any unprejudiced reader,

that the upholding of *apostolical* tradition is only a farther point of strength in our Church in our defence against *Romish* tradition.

I. The unwritten Word, or Tradition, was a rule of Christian faith before there were any Scriptures in existence, as asserted in Sermon III, p. 50.

1. "Our Blessed Saviour, having founded his Church upon the word which he preached, we confess that the *unwritten word, as to that Gospel which he preached, was the first rule of Christians*. But God Almighty, foreseeing how liable such a rule must have been to infinite inconveniences, thought fit to have that word, which was first spoken by mouth, afterwards consigned to writing. By which means the word written and unwritten were not two different rules, but, as to all necessary matters of faith, one and the same. And the *unwritten word, was so far from losing its authority, that it was indeed the more fully established, by being thus delivered to us by the holy Apostles and Evangelists*."—ARCHBISHOP WAKE, *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, Art. XXV.*

2. "In the first place we acknowledge that what is now Holy Scripture, was once only *tradition*, properly so called, that is, doctrine by word of mouth. In this we all agree, that the whole Gospel or doctrine of Christ, which is now upon record in those books we call the Scriptures, *was once unwritten*, when it was first preached by our blessed Saviour and his Apostles."—BISHOP PATRICK, *A Discourse about Tradition, part 1.*

3. "But because the books of Scripture were not all written at once; nor at once communicated, nor at once received, therefore the Churches of God, at first, were forced to *trust their memories*, and to try the doctrines, by *appealing to the memories of others*; that is, to the con-

senting report, and faith delivered and preached to other Churches, especially the chiefest, where the memory of the Apostles was recent and permanent. The mysteriousness of Christ's priesthood, the perfection of his sacrifice, and the unity of it, Christ's advocacy, and intercession for us in heaven, might very well be accounted traditions, before St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was admitted for canonical ; but now they are written truths : and if they had not been written, it is likely we should have lost them."—BISHOP TAYLOR, *Dissuasive*, part I. book i. sec. 3.

4. "And although in sundry respects the former of these,—the Scriptures, be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands, thus much being on many grounds confessed by Bellarmine himself, that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief ; yet there being no less veracity in the tongues, than the hands, in the preachings, than the writings of the Apostles ; nay, '*Prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus,*' saith Tertullian, *the Apostles preached before they writ, planted Churches before they addressed epistles to them* : on these grounds I make no scruple to grant, that apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as apostolical writings, *are equally the matter of a Christian's belief* ; who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is apostolical writing, so the other is apostolical tradition."—HAMMOND, *On Heresy*.

II. Many doctrines were believed and taught on the principle of universal consent, not found in express words in the Scripture, and some only *afterwards* proved from Scripture, such as, Canonicity of Scripture, the Trinity, Infant Baptism, &c. &c. as asserted in Sermon IV, pp. 79—85.

1. "Because we reject all traditions that are not according to the rule of Lirinensis, received everywhere, at all times, and by all; Father Porter lays this down as one of our principles, that all traditions of all sorts are the inventions of men: though he could not but know that *we receive* THE SCRIPTURES *from such an universal tradition*, and are ready to embrace any other doctrine, conveyed to us as they are. With the same sincerity and modesty he affirms, that we pretend that the EXPRESS WORDS of Scripture are our rule of faith, without any interpretation or consequence drawn from them, though (not to mention other Churches) the Church of England declares [Art. VI.], that we are to be guided not only by the express words of Scripture, but by the consequences drawn from it; and yet this gentleman affirms that our confessions of faith pretend only to the express words."—HICKES—"Missionaries' Arts Discovered," chap. v.

2. "If any member of our Church be pressed by those of the Roman persuasion with this argument, for their present traditions, that Scripture itself is come to us by tradition, let them answer thus: Very right, *it is so*, and we thank God for it; therefore let this be no part of our dispute, it being a thing presupposed in all discourses about religion, a thing agreed upon among all Christian people, that we read the word of God when we read the Holy Scriptures. . . . And if they press you again, and say—how do you know that some works are canonical and others not; is it not by a constant tradition? Answer them again in this manner: *Yes, this is true also*, and would to God you would stand to this universal tradition, and receive no other books but what have been so delivered." . . . "And farther, we likewise acknowledge that the sum and substance of the Christian religion contained in the Scriptures, hath been delivered down to us,

even from the Apostles' days, in other ways or forms besides the Scriptures ; for instance, in the baptismal vow, in the Creed, in the prayers and hymns of the Church."
" And thus some part of the Nicene Creed may be called a tradition, as it has expressly declared unto us the sense of the Church of God concerning that great article of our faith, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, which they teach us was always thus understood, '*the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, and of the same substance with his Father.*' " " But more than this, we allow that tradition gives us a considerable assistance in such points, as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence by good and manifest reasoning. This may be called a confirming tradition, of which we have an instance in the *doctrine of Infant Baptism*, which some ancient fathers call an apostolical tradition. Not that it cannot be proved out of the Scriptures—no such matter—for though we do not find it written in so many words, that infants are to be baptized, or that the Apostles baptized infants ; yet it may be proved out of Scriptures, and the fathers themselves, who call it an apostolical tradition, do allege testimonies from the Scriptures to make it good ; and therefore we may be sure they comprehend *the Scriptures within the name of apostolical tradition*, and believed that this doctrine was gathered out of the Scriptures, though not expressly treated of there."
" In like manner, we in this Church assert the authority of bishops above presbyters by a divine right, as appears by the Book of Consecration of Bishops, where the person to be ordained to this office expresses his belief, that he is truly called to this ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now this, we are persuaded, may be plainly enough proved to any man that is ingenuous,

and will fairly consider things out of the Holy Scriptures, without the aid of tradition; but we also take in the *assistance of this*, for the conviction of gainsayers, and by the perpetual practice and *tradition of the Church from the beginning*, confirm our Scripture proofs so strongly, that he seems to us very obstinate, or extremely prejudiced, that yields not to them. And therefore to make our doctrine in this point the more authentic, our Church hath put both these proofs together in the preface to the form for giving orders, which begins in these words: ‘It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that *from the Apostles’ time* there have been three orders of ministers in Christ’s Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.’ ”—BISHOP PATRICK, *A Discourse about Tradition*, part 1.

3. “We receive the number and names of the authors of books divine and canonical as *delivered by tradition*. This tradition we admit, for that, though the books of Scripture have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, but win credit of themselves, and yield sufficient satisfaction to all men, of their divine truth, whence we judge the Church that receiveth them to be led by the Spirit of God; yet the *number, authors, and integrity of the parts of these books*, we receive as *delivered by tradition*. The second kind of tradition which we admit, is that summary comprehension of the chief heads of Christian doctrine, contained in the creed of the Apostles, which was delivered to the Church as the rule of her faith. For though every part thereof be contained in the Scripture, yet the orderly connexion and distinct explication of these principal articles gathered into an epitome, wherein are implied, and whence are inferred, all conclusions theological, is rightly named *a tradition*. The third, is that form of Christian doctrine, and explication of the several

parts thereof, which the first Christians receiving of the same Apostles, that delivered to them the Scriptures, commanded to posterities. This may be rightly named a tradition, not as if we were to believe anything without the warrant and authority of Scripture, but because we need a plain and distinct explication of many things, which are somewhat obscurely contained in Scripture, which being explicated, the Scriptures, which otherwise we should not so easily have understood, yield us satisfaction that they are so indeed, as the Church delivereth them unto us.”—FIELD, *Of the Church*.

4. “The orthodox bishops and doctors in the ancient Church, being to maintain the TRINITY of persons in the Godhead, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of Christ, the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and other like articles of the Catholic religion against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and other heretics; for that the words Trinity, Homousion, Hypostasis, Procession, &c. (which for the better expressing of the Catholic sense they were forced to use), were not expressly to be found in the Holy Scriptures; had recourse, therefore, very often, in their writings against the heretics of their times, *to the tradition of the Church*. Whereby they meant not (as the Papists would now wrest their words) any unwritten doctrine not contained in the Scriptures, but the very doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all faithful Christians in the Catholic Church down from the Apostles’ times till the several present ages wherein they lived.”—SANDERSON, *Ad Clerum*. v. p. 85.

5. “But there are many things which, although they are not read in express and definite terms in the Holy Scriptures, are yet by the common consent of all Christians,

drawn out of these Holy Scriptures. For example : ‘ that there are in the ever blessed TRINITY three distinct persons to be worshipped, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these are, each of them, truly God, and yet there is but one God ; that Christ is God and man, θεάνθρωπος, truly God and truly man, in one and the same person.’ These and such like, although they are not, either in the Old or New Testament, declared in so many words and syllables, yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed on by all Christians, certain few heretics only excepted, of whom no more account is to be had in religion, than of monsters in nature. So also that infants are to receive the ablution of holy baptism, and that sponsors are to be used for that sacrament. That the Lord’s day, or the first day in every seven, is to be religiously observed as a festival. That our Lord’s passion, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, as also the coming of the Holy Ghost, are to be commemorated every year. That the Church is every where to be administered by bishops, distinguished from presbyters, and set over them. These and others of this sort are nowhere in the sacred Scriptures enjoined directly and by name, yet have they notwithstanding, during fourteen hundred years from the apostles, been everywhere received into public use of the Church ; nor can there be found any Church during that period not agreeing to those things. So that there have been, as it were, certain common notions from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians, not so much from any particular passages of holy Scripture, as from all ; from the general scope and tenor of the whole Gospel ; from the very nature and purpose of the religion therein established ; and finally, from the *constant tradition of the apostles*, who, together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical rites of this sort, and, if I may so speak,

general interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other supposition it would be incredible, or even impossible, that they should have been received with so unanimous a consent everywhere, always, and by all."—BEVERIDGE, *Preface to Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. indicatus ac illustratus*.

To the above add the testimony of Hooker, as before quoted, and also the following passage.

6. "Oftentimes it hath been in very solemn manner disputed, whether all things necessary to salvation be necessarily set down in holy Scripture or no. If we define that necessary to salvation whereby the way to salvation is in any sort made more plain, apparent, and easy to be known; then is there no part of true philosophy, no art of account, no kind of science, rightly so called but the Scripture must contain it. If only those things be necessary, as surely none else are, without the knowledge and practice whereof, it is not the will and pleasure of God to make any ordinary grant of salvation, it may be notwithstanding, and oftentimes hath been demanded, how the books of Holy Scripture contain in them all necessary things, whereof things necessary the very chief is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy, *which point it is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach*."—HOOKER, *Eccles. Polity*, book I, § 14.

III. These Catholic Traditions, as embraced in the Church of England, do not necessarily involve the Popish Traditions of Rome, but the contrary, as asserted in Sermon III and IV passim, and in Sermon XVII, p. 479.

1. "We receive with the same veneration whatsoever comes from the Apostles, whether by Scripture or tradition, provided that we can be assured that it comes from

them. And if it can be made appear, that any tradition, which the written word contains not, has been received by all Churches and in all ages, we are ready to embrace it, as coming from the Apostles.

“Monsieur de Meaux therefore ought not to charge us as enemies to tradition, or obstinate not to receive what is so delivered. Our Church rejects not tradition, but only *those things which they pretend to have received by it* ; but which we suppose to be so far from being the doctrines of the Apostles, or of all Churches, in all ages, that we are persuaded there are many of them directly contrary to the written word, which is by themselves confessed to be the Apostle’s doctrine, and which the best and present ages of the world adhered to.”—ARCHBISHOP WAKE, *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England. Article XXV.*

2. “It is a calumny to assert, that the Church of England rejects all tradition, and I hope none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No, the Scripture itself is a tradition, and we admit all other traditions, which are subordinate, and agreeable unto that ; together with all those things which can be proved to be Apostolical by the general testimony of the Church in all ages ; nay, if any thing not contained in Scripture, *which the Roman Church now pretends to be a part of God’s word*, were delivered to us by as universal uncontrolled tradition, as the Scripture is, we should receive it as we do the Scripture.”—BISHOP PATRICK, *as above.*

3. “It is to be observed, that it is only such traditions as have been held by the universal Church in all ages, and all places, such as we can trace up to the apostolical age, and have the evidence of some of the fathers, who living either in the apostolical times, or so near to them that they could not but distinguish between apostolical traditions

and later institutions, have given their testimony concerning. And therefore we justly reject the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of saints, worship of relics and images, and other corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, because we cannot find any evidence for their universality and antiquity. We can trace the original of them all, and find them many years later than the times of the Apostles; but, on the contrary, we find the doctrines and customs of the ages nearest to the Apostles to be directly opposite to these modern traditions. It is not then every tradition that lays an obligation upon Christians, but only such traditions as we have good evidence to believe to have been derived from the Apostles.”—BRETT, *on Tradition*.

4. “ Nor shall I fear to fare the worse among knowing men for relying so far upon traditions, as if a gap were hereby opened for increase of popery. For there are many sorts of traditions allowed of and received by the Protestant doctors, such as have laboured learnedly *for the beating down of popery and all popish traditions of what kind soever*. Chemnitius, that learned and laborious canvasser of the Council of Trent, alloweth of six kinds of traditions to be held in the Church, with whom agreeth our learned Field in his fourth book of the Church, and twentieth chapter. Of these, he maketh the first kind to be the Gospel itself, delivered first by the Apostles *viva voce*, by preaching, conference, and such ways of lively expressions—*et postea literis consignata*, and after committed to writing, as they saw occasion,” &c. &c.—HEYLIN *on the Creed*, Preface, page 12.

The reader should also consult Mr. Keble’s Sermon on “Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture.”

INDEX

OF

THE PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| ABSOLUTION—Romish Doctrine of..... | 184, 196 |
| In what sense the Church has the power of..... | 187 |
| Doctrine of the Church of England..... | 188 |
| Testimony of Hooker, Bingham, and Taylor | 191 |
| Doctrine of Primitive Church..... | 197 |
| ADDITION—the great principle of Romish error | 25, 476 |
| Examples of | 28, 31 |
| AGREEMENT—of Rome and England up to a certain point | 41, 475 |
| ALARM—in the Church concerning Rome | 1, 7 |
| Its causes | 9, 19 |
| ASSUMPTION—Feast of | 443 |
| ANGELS—worship of | 404, 483 |
| ANSWER—of those attacked by party names | 495 |
| BREVARY—quotations from in reference to images | 391 |
| In reference to Saints | 411, 441 |
| In reference to Virgin Mary | 471 |
| BONAVENTURA—his Lady Psalter in honour of the Virgin | 447 |
| CLERGY—duty of in the outery concerning Popery | 21 |
| COMMUNION—weekly, one of the points of complaint concerning Popery | 10 |
| A blessing in the Holy Eucharist | 304 |
| COMMUNION IN ONE KIND..... | 343 |
| History of..... | 344 |
| Present Romish doctrine | 350 |
| Defence from Scripture | 353 |
| Meaning of “all”..... | 357 |
| Against antiquity | 361 |
| Necessity of the cup..... | 365 |
| COMMUNION OF SAINTS | 405 |
| CHURCH—not understood | 97 |
| Described | 99 |
| Agreement between Rome and England | 103 |
| Difference between Rome and England | 105, 480 |
| Pretended infallibility and supremacy of Romish | 105 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| CONFIRMATION—not a sacrament | 137 |
| CONTRITION—part of Romish sacrament of penance | 159 |
| CONFESSION—part of Romish sacrament of penance | 161 |
| In reference to God, a duty | 163 |
| In reference to man, a duty | 165 |
| Church of England advises it | 166 |
| Church of Rome compels it | 171 |
| Testimony of primitive Church concerning | 169, 174 |
| Difference between Rome and England | 480 |
| Testimony of Bingham | 182 |
| COMMEMORATION OF SAINTS..... | 405 |
| DISSENT—subtracts from the Faith | 32 |
| DULEIA—a degree in Romish worship..... | 371 |
| DUTY—of those who speak against others | 498 |
| Of those who are spoken against | 499 |
| EXTREME UNCTION—not a sacrament | 144 |
| EUCCHARIST—A sacrament | 275 |
| Three points in which Rome errs | 276 |
| Sacrifice of mass. See <i>sacrifice</i> | |
| Transubstantiation. See <i>transubstantiation</i> | |
| Communion in one kind. See <i>communion in one kind.</i> | |
| FASTING—one of the points of alarm concerning Popery..... | 12 |
| A religious duty | 481 |
| FORMS—observance of | 13, 485 |
| FATHERS—their testimony concerning | |
| Absolution | 197 |
| Confession | 169 |
| Indulgences | 267 |
| Image worship | 393 |
| Worship of Virgin Mary | 463 |
| Transubstantiation | 333 |
| Communion in one kind | 361 |
| Purgatory | 230 |
| Worship of Saints | 425 |
| The Scriptures..... | 69 |
| GROUND-WORK OF RELIGION | 33 |
| GOOD WORKS—not Satisfactions | 207 |
| Necessary fruits of penitence | 207 |
| HOST—worship of | 340 |
| Processions of | 341 |
| HYPÉ-DULEIA—a degree of Romish worship | 371 |
| HOOKE—his defence against Puritans | 491 |
| His doctrine about tradition | 88 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| IMAGES—worship of | 381 |
| History of introduction | 383 |
| Romish writers concerning..... | 386 |
| Their worship proved from the Missal and Breviary | 391 |
| Against antiquity..... | 393 |
| False references to Scripture | 397 |
| Scripture condemns it..... | 402 |
| IGNORANCE—one of the causes of the outcry concerning Popery ... | 16, 476 |
| INFALLIBILITY—asserted in Church of Rome | 105, 109 |
| INTENTION—of the Priest, necessary for sacramental grace | 148 |
| INTERMEDIATE STATE—doctrine of | 218 |
| How Rome adds to it | 220 |
| INDULGENCES—arise out of the doctrine of purgatory | 245 |
| Four principles assumed to establish | 246 |
| Ancient use of..... | 251 |
| Romish practice of..... | 259 |
| Sale of | 262 |
| Contrary to Scripture | 264 |
| Contrary to antiquity..... | 267 |
| Many Romish writers against it | 269 |
| Denied by the Church of England..... | 270 |
| LATREIA—a degree of Romish worship..... | 370 |
| LADY-PSEALTER—blasphemous doctrine contained in..... | 447 |
| MATRIMONY—not a Sacrament..... | 141 |
| MISSAL—quotations from, in reference to worship of saints, images, &c. | 391 |
| ORDERS (HOLY)—not a sacrament | 140 |
| OUTWARD THINGS—in some degree valuable | 487 |
| PARTY NAMES—injustice of affixing | 23 |
| PENANCE—not a Sacrament | 138, 155 |
| Contains four divisions | 158 |
| PURITANS—their objections against the Church of England | 489 |
| POPERY—our Church's observances mistaken for | 7, 13 |
| PUNISHMENTS—in this world not satisfactions..... | 205 |
| PURGATORY—doctrine of, arises out of Satisfactions | 217 |
| Romish Councils concerning | 221 |
| Romish writers concerning | 223 |
| Against Scripture | 224 |
| Against antiquity | 230 |
| Various evils of | 239 |
| Compared with intermediate state..... | 341 |
| RELICS—respect for, natural | 373 |
| Ancient relics, origin of | 374 |
| Worship of | 372 |
| Romish writers concerning | 379 |
| Romish councils concerning | 377 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| ROMANISM—adds to the faith | 25, 43, 46 |
| Same now as formerly | 321 |
| RELIGION—differs from all other subjects | 35 |
| REVELATION—may have been imparted two ways | 37 |
| REAL PRESENCE—not Transubstantiation | 334 |
| SELF-INTEREST—one of the causes of the alarm about Popery | 9 |
| SUPREMACY—in Church of Rome | 106, 111, 117 |
| SACRAMENTS—definition of | 125 |
| Six points necessary | 128 |
| Number of | 130-135 |
| Used in two senses | 131 |
| Compared with Rome | 482 |
| SACRIFICE—ancient doctrine of, in Eucharist | 279 |
| Proved from Scripture | 281 |
| Church of England maintains it | 284, 287 |
| Testimony of our divines | 289 |
| Value of this doctrine | 291 |
| Romish doctrine a corruption | 293 |
| Difference between the two Churches | 297 |
| Evils of their doctrine | 301 |
| Blessings of our doctrine | 303 |
| SAINTS—observance of their days one of the causes of alarm about Popery | 9 |
| Worship of, in Rome | 404 |
| Commemoration of, in England | 405 |
| Four degrees in worship of | 409 |
| Romish Councils | 413 |
| Their defence of | 415 |
| False reference to Scripture | 417 |
| Against Scripture | 421 |
| Against Antiquity | 425 |
| Two arguments against it | 430 |
| Comparison between Rome and England | 483 |
| SATISFACTIONS—Romish doctrine of | 201 |
| Theory of, as atonements for sin | 205 |
| Do not consist in good works | 207 |
| Not according to God's mercy | 209 |
| Against the doctrine of Christ's atonement | 211 |
| SCRIPTURE—contains all things necessary for salvation | 39 |
| Contrasted with tradition | 69, 91 |
| Only proof of doctrine | 95 |
| False references to by Romanists | 417, 353, 397 |
| Against Worship of Saints | 421 |
| Purgatory | 224 |
| Transubstantiation | 327 |
| Image-Worship | 402 |
| Worship of Virgin Mary | 456 |
| Indulgences | 264 |
| Proves sacrificial character of Eucharist | 281 |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| TRADITION— | explanation of | 49 |
| | History of | 51 |
| | Unwritten, previous to written | 56, 479 |
| | Inferior to Scripture | 59 |
| | Different meanings of, in our Articles | 61 |
| | Rome and England contrasted | 61-68 |
| | Use of | 74 |
| | Doctrines first taught by | 79-86 |
| | Hooker's testimony concerning | 87 |
| | Baxter's testimony concerning | 89 |
| | Compared with Scripture | 91 |
| | Pearson's testimony | 92 |
| | Other testimony of our divines | 503, 517 |
| TRANSUBSTANTIATION— | a certain change in things holy | 309 |
| | Doctrine of the Church of England | 312 |
| | Compared with Rome | 315 |
| | Origin of | 316 |
| | Romish Councils concerning | 318 |
| | Romish writers concerning | 323 |
| | Contrary to Scripture | 327 |
| | Contrary to Antiquity | 329 |
| | Differs from "Real Presence" | 333 |
| | Error of, arises from definition | 334 |
| VIRGIN MARY— | worship of | 435 |
| | How far the Church of England respects | 437 |
| | Romish festivals in honour of | 414 |
| | Romish prayers to | 445 |
| | Lady-psalter in honour of | 447 |
| | Romish writers concerning | 449 |
| | Modern writers | 453 |
| | Silence of Scripture concerning | 456 |
| | Her Worship— | |
| | Against antiquity | 463 |
| | Against God's mercy | 465 |
| | Against God's honour | 467 |
| | Hymns dedicated to | 471 |
| WORSHIP— | of Host | 341 |
| | Different degrees of | 371 |
| | Of Relics | 373 |
| | Of Images | 381 |
| | Of Saints | 403 |
| | Of Virgin Mary | 435 |
| | Of Angels | 484 |

Works by the same Author.

I.

A GUIDE TO THE HOLY EUCHARIST,

In 2 vols. 18mo. cloth, price 8s.

Vol. I.—Meditations for Home.

Vol. II.—For Use at Church.

II.

SERMONS ON MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS,

WITH INTRODUCTIONS, NOTES, APPENDICES, ETC.

In 2 vols. 12mo. price 14s.

Or separately, Vol. I. bds. 6s. 6d ; Vol. II. 7s. 6d.

III.

THE EUCHARIST,

Its History, Doctrine, and Practice, with Meditations and Prayers
suitable to that Holy Sacrament.

In 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

IV.

THREE SERMONS ON MARRIAGE,

Explaining the New Act with regard to Churchmen and Dissenters.

12mo. sewed, 1s.

V.

“IF ANY PROVIDE NOT FOR HIS OWN.”

A SERMON PREACHED IN AID OF THE FUNDS OF THE NORTH-WEST
LONDON PROVIDENT DISPENSARY.

12mo. sewed, 6d.

* * The profits arising from the sale of this Sermon will be given to the
Institution in whose aid it was preached.

June 1842.

W. J. CLEAVER'S

NEW CATALOGUE.

Now publishing in Numbers,
**THE ECCLESIASTICAL ANTIQUITIES OF THE
CYMRY, OR THE ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH;
ITS HISTORY, DOCTRINE, AND RITES.**

Under the above title will be published a series of interesting Tracts, illustrative of the character of the Ancient British Church during its metropolitical independence.

The following are some of the subjects on which valuable information will be given :

The Introduction of Christianity—The National Establishment of the Church—Dioceses and Parishes—The Foundation and Endowment of Churches—Sanctuaries—Monasteries—Apostolical Sanction—Councils—Heresies—Persecutions—Martyrs—Saints—Liturgy—Fasts and Festivals—Marriages and Divorces—Burials—Oaths—Intercourse with Foreign Churches—Independence of Rome.

No. 1 (Introductory), on Bardism, now ready.

A DISCOURSE ON THE RIGHT OF THE CHURCH IN A CHRISTIAN STATE,

By HERBERT THORNDIKE, B.D. formerly Prebendary of Westminster.

Printed in 1649.

A New Edition, with an Appendix, General Index, &c. and Preface by the Rev. J. S. BREWER, M.A. Queen's College, Oxford, and Assistant Minister of Ely Chapel, Holborn.

1 vol. demy 12mo. 8s. 6d. cloth.

INSTITUTES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ANCIENT AND MODERN,

By JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D.

A new and literal Translation from the original Latin, with copious additional Notes, by JAMES MURDOCH, D.D. Edited with additions by HENRY SOAMES, M.A. Rector of Stapleford Tawney, with Thoydon Mount, Essex.

In 4 vols. 8vo. 52s.

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE CHURCH MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS,

By the Rev. CYRIL HUTCHINSON, M.A. late Student of Christ Church, and Rector of Batsford, Gloucestershire.

1 vol. foolscap 8vo. 4s. 6d. bds.

BEAUFORT'S NORRISIAN ESSAY.
SCRIPTURE SUFFICIENT WITHOUT
TRADITION,

Or the Doctrine of the Sixth Article of the British Churches maintained, in an Essay which obtained the Norrisian gold medal at the University of Cambridge, for 1840. By the REV. D. A. BEAUFORT, M.A. of Jesus College, and Assistant Minister of Portman Chapel, St. Marylebone.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE SAINTS' DAYS AND
OTHER FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH,

A Course of Lectures delivered in the Parish Church of Burghfield, Berks, by the Rev. HENRY CURTIS CHERRY, M.A., Rector of Burghfield, and Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord de Saumarez.
Vol. I. 12mo. bds. 4s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS,

By the late Rev. HENRY JACKSON CLOSE, M.A.
18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

SERMONS ON THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST
IN THE WILDERNESS,

By the Rev. E. SCOBELL, M.A. Incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere Street.
12mo. cloth, 4s.

By the same Author,
CHRISTIAN FASTING,

A Sermon preached at St. Peter's on the first Sunday in Lent 1842,
8vo. 9d.; published by request.

THE BLESSED COMPANY OF THE FAITHFUL,

A Sermon preached on Palm Sunday, 1842,
8vo. 9d.; published by request.

Also,

PSALMS AND HYMNS,

Selected and adapted to the purposes of Public Worship.
18mo. 2s.

PUSEYISM,

A Short Dialogue between a Lady and a Parson.
Fourth Thousand, with Additions, price 1d. or 4s. per 100.

THE CHILD AND THE HERMIT,
OR A SEQUEL TO THE STORY WITHOUT AN END,
By C. M.

Square 16mo. second edition, price 2s. 6d.

THE SIEGE OF BARCELONA,

A POEM, IN THREE CANTOS,

By Gustavus Butler Hippisley, Esq.

Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 5s.

WILD FLOWERS FROM THE GLENS,

By E. L. L.

8vo. cloth, 7s.

DEBRETTS'S PEERAGE,

New edition, by G. W. Collen, Esq.

In 1 vol. 8vo. 30s.

OBSERVATIONS,

By E. W.

Second edition, 18mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

ADELE, A TALE OF FRANCE,

By Miss E. Randall.

Small 8vo. cloth, 7s.

ROSABEL AND HELVETIA,

Poems in Two Cantos each,

By Thomas Charles Cuthrey, Esq. of the Inner Temple,

Post 8vo. cloth, 4s.

Shortly will be published,
ORIGINAL FAMILIAR CORRESPONDENCE
BETWEEN RESIDENTS IN INDIA,

INCLUDING SKETCHES OF JAVA, &c.

1 Vol. post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Also,

THE COTTAGE ON THE COMMON,

By the Author of "The Child and the Hermit."

Square 16mo.









THE ARCHIVE

